The Journal

OF

PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

INGRAM BYWATER, M.A.

HENRY JACKSON, Litt. D.

H. W. GARROD, M.A.

VOL. XXXIII.

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO. Ltd.
Cambridge: BOWES AND BOWES.
DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO.
1914

724

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

CONTENTS

No. LXV.

	PAGE
On Apollonius Rhodius. ARTHUR PLATT	1
ΑΙΟΣ and ΕΙΟΣ in Latin Poetry. A. E. HOUSMAN . . .	54
The Latinizations of the Modern Surname. I. BYWATER . .	76
The Doom of the Argonauts. W. R. HARDIE	95
Notes on Manil. IV, 590 and Lucr. V, 1009—1010. W. R. HARDIE	102
The Transpadani and the Colony of Novum Comum. E. G. HARDY	103
The ΣΥΡΙΓΞ Technopaegnium. A. S. F. GOW	128
Three Passages of Cicero's Letters. J. D. DUFF	139
An Oracle in Procopius. HENRY JACKSON	142

No. LXVI.

PAGE

Hesiod's Wagon. A. S. F. Gow 145

Cicero's Commission and Movements at the beginning of the Civil War. J. D. Duff 154

Suetonius. J. D. Duff 161

Notes on the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle. H. Richards . . . 172

ΛΟΓΟΣ and ΜΕΣΟΤΗΣ in the *De Anima* of Aristotle. J. L. Stocks 182

On some Ancient Plant-Names. W. Thiselton-Dyer . 195

Emendations of the Text of Socrates Scholasticus. F. C. Conybeare 208

The Phillipps Manuscripts of Juvenal. S. G. Owen . . . 238

Orphica. Arthur Platt 265

Thucydidea. Arthur Platt 270

The Composition and Chronology of the *Thoughts* of Marcus Aurelius. C. R. Haines 278

A Fragment of Corinna. J. U. Powell 296

On *Eudemian Ethics* 1215 a 29 : 1215 b 20 : 1224 b 2. Henry Jackson 298

William Aldis Wright : A Personal Appreciation. Sidney Colvin 299

In Memoriam : William Aldis Wright 302

THE JOURNAL
OF
PHILOLOGY

ON APOLLONIUS RHODIUS.

The following paper owes its inception and a certain amount of its information to Mr Mooney's recent edition of the *Argonautica*. Mr Mooney has made three excellent corrections in the text, i 517, ii 1179, iv 1562, and his text as a whole is the best yet printed; he has gone further towards providing an apparatus criticus than any of his predecessors; his is the first English edition with an English commentary, and his commentary is frequently very useful. This is a great deal to have done, and I am unfeignedly grateful to him myself. I fear that he will find my gratitude overpowering, and will wish that I had "dissembled my love" altogether, but to edit classics is to invite criticism and I trust that none of mine is unfair. If he often misunderstands the poet, he is not one atom worse in this than the other critics so far as I have ascertained. Nor must it be supposed that all the mistranslations I comment on are his.

i 74. *σὺν καὶ τρίτος ἦεν Οἰλεύς.*

Throughout the catalogue of the Argonauts the verbs used are verbs of motion, *ἤλυθε*, *εἵπετο*, *κίε* and so on. Here therefore read *ἦιεν*. Ap. generally uses the form *ἤιεν*, but *ἦε* is undisputed at ii 198 and *ἦεν* at iv 454. Compare also *σ* 253, *τ* 126. The same corruption is in Tzetzes *τὰ πρὸ Ὁμήρου*, 185.

i 82. *ὡς οὐκ ἀνθρώποισι κακὸν μήκιστον ἐπαυρεῖν.*

Read *ὧς*, "so true is it." To take *ὡς* to mean "how," or "since," does not suit so well with the context.

i 108. *καὶ πλόον ἠελίῳ τε καὶ ἀστέρι τεκμήρασθαι.*

There seems to be no parallel in Greek for this use of *ἀστέρι* to mean *the* star *par excellence*, but compare Dante *Inferno* ii 55:

Lucevan gli occhi suoi più che la Stella;

only in Dante the star is Venus, in Ap. the Bear. And in Alcaeus 39, 40 *τὸ ἄστρον* means Sirius. Critias has *λαμπρὸς ἀστέρος μύδρος*, on which Nauck audaciously says "*ἡλίου* scribendum suspicor" (frag. *Sisyphus* 35).

i 110. *μετὰ δ' ἦλυθεν ἐλδομένοισιν.*

The dative after *μετὰ* is here extraordinary; it is true that Ap. mishandles prepositions outrageously, and is always using *μετὰ* for *πρός*, but he puts an accusative after it when he does so. i 648, *pace* Mr Mooney, is a very different matter, and iii 892 is regarded as corrupt by Merkel and others. Read therefore here *μέγα δ' ἦλυθεν ἐλδομένοισιν.* Quintus has *μέγα* with *ἐελδόμενος* at ii 639, viii 410, xiv 220.

i 129. *δεσμοῖς ἰλλόμενον μεγάλων ἀπεθήκατο νώτων.*

ἀπεσείσατο is given for *ἀπεθήκατο* in a quotation by Simplicius. The scholiast says that *ἀπεθήκατο* shows the strength of Heracles, because it implies putting down *εὐχερῶς*. This note shews that there was a double reading, for nobody would have thought of writing it on the word *ἀπεθήκατο* by itself, and it also shews that *ἀπεθήκατο* was preferred because *ἀπεσείσατο* sounded too rough, as if Heracles shook his burden off clumsily. Preferred then by whom? By Apollonius himself, I should conjecture; that is, I infer that he wrote *ἀπεσείσατο* in his first edition, and altered it to *ἀπεθήκατο* owing to adverse criticism. Our MSS. represent the second recension, not the first.

Wellauer holds just the opposite view on this line, but he misses the inference to be drawn from the scholion and cannot explain why the first recension should be here preferred by the MSS.

i 134. *Ναύπλιος. ἦ γὰρ ἔην Κλυτονήου Ναυβολίδαο.*

This is the only line in Apollonius which breaks a rule almost absolute in post-Hesiodic hexameters. A single word scanning as an ionic a minore should not stand before the bucolic diaeresis, as *Κλυτονήου* here does. It is excused because Ap., like all poets, takes liberties with proper names.

A word of this form in this place is already much rarer in Homer than one would have expected (*Journ. Phil.* no. 35, p. 121). In Hesiod there are eight instances. In Quintus only two, iii 411, vi 404. Manetho is freer, see i 182, ii 475, iii 177, 312, iv 555, vi 651. The only other instance in any tolerable poetry I have noted is Theocritus x 38. (xxiv 106 corr. Wilamowitz.)

A molossus is hardly, if at all, more rigorously excluded from this position. Hesiod yields three examples, *Asp. Her.* 278, *Erga* 397, 443, Quintus one, xi 68, Manetho two, ii 333, iii 286, Oppian two, *Hal.* i 83, ii 342.

There are a good many instances of both rhythms in that distressing collection the *Orphica*, and yet even there the offending word is very often a proper name.

But Apollonius goes even further than this, as I daresay the other post-Homeric poets may do too but cannot say I ever thought about enquiring into this. He not only does not allow a single word forming an ionic a minore to stand in this position, but scarcely suffers any group of words of that scansion to do so. I do not count in lines like ii 194:

αὐτίκα δ' εἰσαΐων ἐνοπὴν καὶ δοῦπον ὁμίλου,

because the break in the line there comes before *καί*, nor again such as i 389:

τριβόμενοι, περὶ δέ σφιν ἀιδνὴ κήκιε λιγνύς,

but besides the like of these, I believe that the only instances in our poet are the following:

i 1047, *ἠδὲ καὶ Ἀρτακέα, πρόμον ἀνδρῶν· οὓς ἔτι πάντας.*
ii 32, *ὤπασε Λημνιάδων· ὁ δ' ἐρεμνὴν δίπτυχα λώπην.*
ii 152, *πόντον ἐπέπλωμεν· μάλα δ' ἡμέων αὐτὸς ἕκαστος.*
ii 1190, *πρὶν καὶ πετράων σχεδὸν ἐλθεῖν, αἵ τ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ.*
iii 701, *λίσσομ' ὑπὲρ μακάρων σέο τ' αὐτῆς ἠδὲ τοκήων.*

And at ii 1190 Brunck is doubtless right in reading *ἐλθέμεν*. To these must apparently be added iii 1353:

ἀφρὸς ἀπὸ στόματος χαμάδις ῥεῖ χωομένοιο,

for I do not see how Mr Samuelsson can be wrong in here changing *ῥέε* to *ῥεῖ*, and yet I believe that this rhythm ⏑ ⏑ – | – | at this place cannot be paralleled in all the rest of the epic; also the contraction of *ῥεῖ* is almost unique in it, and it is possible that the truth has not yet been here discovered. It may be added that ii 152 is a wretched line; we should expect some adverb instead of *ἡμέων*.

At i 1187 L offers as a line:

αὐτὰρ ὁ δαίνυσθαι ἑτάροις εὖ ἐπιτείλας.

Other MSS. emend variously, and none of them are worth quoting seriously. But one Paris MS. has led some editors astray with *ἑτάροις οἷς εὖ*, which is not only hideous but also breaks this metrical rule.

Quintus agrees entirely with Ap. in this matter. When the ionic is formed of more than one word he avoids the rhythm as a rule, the only exceptions being:

i 830, *μέχρις ἠῶ δῖαν ἱκέσθαι.*
ii 196, *πεδίον πᾶν· τοὶ δ' ἐπέχυντο.*
ii 229, *βάλε δ' ἄλλων πολλὰ κάρηνα.*
iv 507, *ἐπὶ νύσσῃ δ' ἔσταν ἕκαστοι.*
vii 634, *κρατερὸν παῖδ' εἰσενόησε.*
viii 3, *καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ὄβριμοι υἷες.*
viii 473, *πέλει ἠώς, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐχθρή.*
ix 533, *ἅμα δ' ἠοῖ δαῖτα πένοντο.*
xiv 180, *κρατερὸν κῆρ ἰσοθέοιο.*

Of these only three are of the type ⏑ ⏑ – | – | and all three are to say the least doubtful. At ii 196 the best MSS. read *πεδίον ἅπαν*, and perhaps Q. wrote *πεδίον ἅπαν· οἱ*, as Rhodomann read, but the lengthening of the last syllable of *πεδίον* is very doubtful for Quintus. At vii 634 *πάιν* or *πάιδ'*? *πάιδας* is read in Stesichorus 8 (Bergk), *παῖδι* in Anacreon 17. And in xiv 180 read *κέαρ*. Q. thus agrees with Ap. in particularly disliking the type ⏑ ⏑ – | – |. He agrees again with him in allowing comparatively often the type ⏑ ⏑ | – – |. And like

him he has only one instance of the type ⏑ | ⏑ – – which we should have thought would be perfectly unobjectionable.

i 151. *οἵ τ' Ἀφαρητιάδαι...ἔβαν.*

Throughout this catalogue the new heroes are introduced with *δὲ* or *αὖ* or something stronger still. Besides *οἵ τε* is barely possible, because it necessitates taking *οἱ Ἀφαρητιάδαι* together with an Attic use of the article, whereas *οἱ δὲ* is the ordinary epic article. Look too at the catalogue in the *Iliad*. It is unnecessary to give examples of the confusion between the two particles; there are at least nine instances of it in Ap.

i 164. *Ἀγκαῖος, τὸν μέν ῥα πατὴρ Λυκόοργος ἔπεμπεν.*

Punctuate with a colon after *Ἀγκαῖος*, for though either *μὲν* or *ῥα* alone may follow the relative they cannot both together do so. Cf. 193.

i 204. *τοὔνεκ' ἦην πόδας σιφλός.*

Palaemonius was son of Hephaestus and therefore lame. Hephaestus was notoriously lame of both feet; why should his son be lame of only one? *πόδας* is the reading of L, *πόδα* of G, the second best MS. but notoriously interpolated; duals in Ap. are several times corrupted into plurals, and five MSS. here give *πόδε*. Yet editors commonly read *πόδα*! And look at the account of the man in *Orph. Arg.* 211:

σίνετο δὲ σφυρὰ δισσά, πόδας δ' οὐκ ἦεν ἀρηρώς.

i 219. *τὼ μὲν ἐπ' ἀκροτάτοισι ποδῶν ἑκάτερθεν ἐρεμνὰς*
σεῖον ἀειρομένω πτέρυγας.

That the wings of Zetes and Calais should be described as black has always struck me as odd. They also have black hair, *κυάνεαι ἔθειραι*, and they alone of the Argonauts apparently, for in several places Ap. describes the whole set as *ξανθοί*, meaning clearly yellow-haired, e.g. ii 159. I fancy that he must here, as notoriously in some other places, be following a picture. Mr Ernest Gardner informs me that Boreas is represented as black-haired, and that the vases on which the Boreadae are represented are probably derived from Polygnotus or his school. Perhaps then it is some painting by Polygnotus that Ap. has in mind. Ovid (*Met.* vi 715) disagrees.

i 246. *ἀλλ' οὐ φυκτὰ κέλευθα πόνος δ' ἄπρηκτος ἰοῦσιν.*

The ancients could not understand this line; the scholia talk mere nonsense over it. The bystanders have just said that Aeetes will never be able to withstand such a band of heroes, and seem to go on with: "but then there's the journey, they can't evade *that, if they mean to get to Colchis*, and the difficulties are insuperable *on the way*" (not of course "for those who go," which is neither grammatical nor pointed).

The great difficulty is *φυκτά*; people have been misled by supposing this to signify that the Argonauts cannot evade the commands of Pelias. That has nothing to do with the context, and is not true, for they need not have gone if they didn't like.

Imitated by Quintus, xiv 518, *πόνος δ' ἄπρηκτος ὄρωρει*; he means *ἀμήχανος* and is right in so understanding his predecessor.

i 332. *ἄλλα μὲν ὅσσα τε νηὶ ἐφοπλίσσασθαι ἔοικεν*
πάντα γὰρ εὖ κατὰ κόσμον ἐπαρτέα κεῖται ἰοῦσιν,
τῷ οὐκ ἂν δηναιὸν ἐχοίμεθα τοῖο ἔκητι
ναυτιλίης.

I think we should punctuate thus, with only a comma after *ἰοῦσιν*. With a full stop there we are driven to emending the text or assuming *πάντα γὰρ εὖ κατὰ κόσμον* to be a violent and pointless parenthesis. The meaning is "since everything is ready, therefore let us not wait." There is no objection to *τῷ in apodosi*. The position of *γὰρ* is however strange; I take it that the first line only makes a sort of false start; "as for the rest, since all is ready &c."

Compare ii 882, where again the editors go wrong over *τῷ in apodosi*:

ἡμῖν δ' ἐν γὰρ ἔασι κυβερνητῆρες ὁμίλῳ,
καὶ πολέες, τῷ μή τι διατριβώμεθα πείρης.

It is true that *δ' ἐν* is a correction of Merkel's for *μέν*, but it appears to be right; other proposals cut out the *γὰρ* and spoil the construction.

i 452. *δειελινὸν κλίνοντος ὑπὸ ζόφον ἠελίοιο.*

This line describes early afternoon, when the sun is just past *σταθερὸν ἦμαρ* (450). *δειελινὸν* must be adverbial, for *δειελινὸς*

ζόφος would be absurd. How then can the sun be inclining ὑπὸ ζόφον? Surely this phrase could only be used of sunset. Is not this yet another instance of the everlasting confusion of ὑπὸ and ἐπί? Cf. Theocr. xxv 85, 86.

i 592. ἔνθεν δὲ προτέρωσε παρεξέθεον Μελίβοιαν,
ἀκτήν τ' αἰγιαλόν τε δυσήνεμον εἰσορόωντες,
ἠῶθεν δ' Ὁμόλην αὐτοσχεδὸν εἰσορόωντες
πόντῳ κεκλιμένην παρεμέτρεον.

Since Wellauer the second of these lines is generally bracketed, but it looks genuine; it cannot well come from the first recension, as has been suggested, because it never could have stood as a variant on 594; the phenomenon of the double εἰσορόωντες is much more easily explained by supposing it to come from the next line, displacing the original ending. If one considers the sense, it is clear that we want a genitive depending on ἀκτήν τ' αἰγιαλόν τε; to alter to ἐκπερόωντες (Meineke) is unsatisfactory because the ἀκτή and beach ought to be more clearly defined. Unluckily the geography of Ap. is so abominably bad that it is not much use trying to find out what the genitive was[1]; Grote puts it very mildly when he says in a note to Part II, chap. 40 of his History that "the geography of Ap. Rhod. (i 560—580)[2] seems sadly inaccurate."

For corruption due to the next line see i 234, 942, ii 143, 543, iii 1267.

i 638. ἀμηχανίῃ δ' ἐχέοντο
ἄφθογγοι.

Hardly can ἐχέοντο be right; in 635 προχέοντο is correctly used, but ἐχέοντο uncompounded cannot mean "they poured out"; besides the repetition is itself unlike Ap. The construction of ἀμηχανίῃ is of course right enough, and no objection can be taken to that. But I think Ap. wrote ἀμηχανίῃ δ' ἐνέχοντο; see Hdt. i 190, Κῦρος δὲ ἀπορίῃσι ἐνείχετο (L. and S.); Ap. himself has χρειοῖ ἐνισχόμενος at iv 358.

ἐνέοντο is a verb of which he is very fond; at ii 1094

[1] Ὀρμενίοιο or Ἀστερίοιο suits the metre; both places are in the right neighbourhood.

[2] Qu. 560—600?

ἐνέοντο is corrupted into ἐνέποντο and ἐνέμοντο in the best MSS.; but it would be feeble here.

The old reading ἐκέχυντο at Quintus ii 195 has been long corrected from MSS.

i 671. τῇ καὶ παρθενικαὶ πίσυρες σχεδὸν ἑδριόωντο
ἀδμῆτες λευκῇσιν ἐπιχνοάουσαι ἐθείραις.

Terrible nonsense has been written on this passage; Mr Seaton is of course right in saying that Polyxo, being exceeding old, is naturally attended by elderly ladies, with hair "slightly tinged with snowy tufts." We should not expect her to be surrounded by backfishes or flappers. But I can no more parallel this use of παρθενικαὶ from Greek than he can; in English however there is an exact parallel. When Gareth came to the third crossing of the river to fight the Evening Star, "forth a grizzled damsel came," appropriate to Evening as the others are to Polyxo. Is there any other instance of "damsel" used like this in English poetry? Tennyson seems to me to be bolder than Apollonius, for in the nature of things there seems no reason why παρθενικὴ should imply youth. Anyhow "grizzled damsel" is an exact enough translation of Apollonius, though probably by pure coincidence. At iii 666 there is a similar passage; the attendant of Medea is described as ἥ οἱ ἑπέτις πέλε κουρίζουσα; Meineke's κουριζούσῃ is tempting at first sight, but unnecessary; the attendant is herself described as girlish because that suits her to her mistress.

i 760. βούπαις οὔπω πολλός.

The Scholiast first explains βούπαις as μέγας παῖς, and then οὔπω πολλὸς as οὔπω τέλειος ἀνήρ (an odd thing by the way to say of Apollo). But πολλὸς does not mean ἀνήρ, and to say that anybody is "a big lad not yet big" is ridiculous. Read οὕτω πολλός, "just a big lad."

i 811. αὕτως δ' ἀδμῆτές τε κόραι χῆραί τ' ἐπὶ τῇσιν.

If we accept Mr Rzach's ἀδμῆτες κοῦραι we get two pieces of dubious metre at a blow. Only three lines in the whole epic (ii 13, iii 700, iv 922) begin with four spondees, and when there is a strong caesura in the fifth foot there ought to be a weak one in the third. But Mr Rzach's ideas of epic metre

may be judged from his endeavour to credit Ap. with a weak caesura in the fourth foot at i 110.

i 922. *κεῖθεν δ' εἰρεσίῃ Μέλανος διὰ βένθεα πόντου*
ἰέμενοι τῇ μὲν Θρῄκων χθόνα, τῇ δὲ περαίην
Ἴμβρον ἔχον καθύπερθε.

Sailing from Samothrace to the Chersonese the Argonauts could not be said to have Imbros on the north, not even by Ap. *καθύπερθε* must mean "out to sea," for which cf. not only *γ* 170 (referred to by Mr Mooney, though he desperately endeavours to defend "the north") but also *ἄνω* in Ω 544. At sunset they come to *Χερόνησον προύχουσαν*, apparently the south point of the Chersonese (925). Ap. forgets all about the night, as he does again at ii 727 ; at least he says nothing about it. Then at 928 we are told :

πέλαγος δὲ τὸ μὲν καθύπερθε λέλειπτο
ἦρι, τὸ δ' ἐννύχιοι Ῥοιτειάδος ἔνδοθεν ἀκτῆς
μέτρεον.

Here again *καθύπερθε* is troublesome; we should not take *τὸ καθύπερθε πέλαγος* together, because that is not an epic use of the article; it must mean "they had left out to sea (as compared with the narrow Hellespont, or perhaps *behind*) the *πέλαγος* on the one hand, and by night were off Rhoeteum." With *τὸ δὲ* supply "the narrows" by zeugma out of *πέλαγος*, the *open* sea. Ap. is fond of zeugma.

They got from Athos to Lemnos in one day (601—8). Yet, with a fair wind, they take a whole day from turning into the Hellespont to reach Rhoeteum, and then in one night they do all the rest of the Hellespont. The poet's chronology is as bad as his geography.

i 934. *καὶ δὴ τοίγ' ἐπὶ νυκτὶ διάνδιχα νηὸς ἰούσης*
δίνῃ πορφύροντα διήνυσαν Ἑλλήσποντον.

I do not see how *διάνδιχα* can mean anything but "zigzag." Yet all the places mentioned are on the east side of the Hellespont. Did Ap. really know where they were? He has got them in the wrong order anyhow, for Abarnis ought to come after Pityea.

i 936. ἔστι δέ τις αἰπεῖα Προποντίδος ἔνδοθι νῆσος
τυτθὸν ἀπὸ Φρυγίης πολυληίου ἠπείροιο
εἰς ἅλα κεκλιμένη, ὅσσον τ' ἐπιμύρεται ἰσθμὸς
χέρσῳ ἐπιπρηνὴς καταειμένος· ἐν δέ οἱ ἀκταὶ
ἀμφίδυμοι, κεῖνται δ' ὑπὲρ ὕδατος Αἰσήποιο.

Whether Cyzicus was originally a real island, and, if so, when it became a peninsula, does not here concern me. But if Ap. is not here describing a peninsula there is no understanding a word he says about anything. It seems that some people do not know that *νῆσος* in Greek poetry may be used of a peninsula. An *ἰσθμὸς χέρσῳ ἐπιπρηνὴς καταειμένος* cannot be twisted into anything but an isthmus joining the mainland. Ap. then says quite plainly that Cyzicus was a *νῆσος* with a narrow neck joining the continent. Valerius is equally clear at ii 629—635.

Then *ἀκταὶ ἀμφίδυμοι* is also quite plain. A *λιμὴν ἀμφίδυμος* may mean a harbour with two entrances, but Ap. does not say *ἀκταὶ ἀμφίδυμοι* when he means *λιμὴν ἀμφίδυμος*. His *ἀκταὶ ἀμφίδυμοι* can only mean that the isthmus has two beaches, and that the two bays on each side of it form two harbours. If you want to get the other meaning you must read *ἐν δ' ἐπιωγὴ ἀμφίδυμος*. But why want anything but the text, which is quite simple?

But Ap. knew no more about Cyzicus than he did about Thessaly or the Hellespont. He makes the Argo first enter the *καλὸς λιμήν*, which can only be the harbour upon the west side of the isthmus (954). Thence the Cyzicenes prevail upon them to row on to the "harbour of the city." Mr Mooney cannot be right in translating *πέπιθον* "urged"; that is *ἔπειθον*. They did then go on to the "city-harbour" and built an altar. Next morning they went up Mount Dindymon, "and had by that time rowed further on to the *Χυτὸς λιμήν*" (986). Thus they enter three distinct harbours, to say nothing of the *Θρηίκιος* in 110. Before they had got up Mount Dindymon the Giants, descending from the mountain on the island, blocked up the *Χυτὸς λιμήν*.

If Ap. were an accurate topographer it might be worth while to try and identify these harbours. But if he knew nothing about the coast of Thessaly, what prospect is there of

his knowing anything about Cyzicus[1]? In each case he has a lot of place-names in his possession and uses them without knowing exactly what they imply. He knows that Cyzicus is a peninsula, and that there are such and such harbours, and gets them all in somehow; more we cannot expect. Did the Argo pass through the canal across the isthmus? There is no word about that; Ap. probably argued that the canal could not have been made in those days, if he knew of it at all. Did she go all round the *νῆσος*? No word about that either. It is hopeless to tackle such vague stuff; we cannot find out from him whether the city of the Doliones was north or south of the isthmus.

But observe anyhow that the Χυτὸς λιμὴν has only one mouth (990), which again shews that *ἀκταὶ ἀμφίδυμοι* is not *λιμὴν ἀμφίδυμος*. We may guess that it is meant to be on the east side, opposite to the *καλός*, but the city-harbour, which Ap. mentions most perfunctorily, baffles all conjecture. How perplexed he was with all these havens himself appears from the casual way in which he sticks in "they *had* rowed on *ἄρα*" at 986. For they must have done this before they went up Dindymon.

In 940 it is necessary to read *κεῖται* for *κεῖνται*. Nobody would ever say that the two coasts of an isthmus lie beyond a river. The words *ἐν δέ οἱ ἀκταὶ ἀμφίδυμοι* are evidently a mere parenthesis. The Scholiast had *κεῖται*, for his words are: *ἐστὶ δέ τις ἐν τῇ Προποντίδι νῆσος ὑψηλή...*, *ἐπικειμένη τῇ γῇ...ἔχουσα ἑκατέρωθεν ἀκτάς*. The scholion on 936 is a jumble of distinct notes, some sensible and some silly, contradicting one another flatly; the last words upon *ἀμφίδυμοι* are of the silly class though they have been seriously quoted by the anti-peninsula theorists.

i 986. *ἐν δ' ἄρα τοίγε*
νῆα Χυτῷ λιμένι προτέρου ἐξήλασαν ὅρμου.

ἐν G, *ἐκ* cett. Χυτῷ λιμένι *Et. Mag.*, Χυτοῦ λιμένος MSS., Schol. The *Et. Mag.* is an authority of the first importance for Apollonius. It is right against all the MSS. in the following passages:

[1] He is said to have had good authorities, but how did he use them?

i 551, Ἀθηναίης Ἰτωνίδος for Τριτωνίδος (Ἰτωνίδος is given as a variant in L).

i 636, Θυιάσιν for θωάσιν or θυάσιν.

i 789, διὰ παστάδος for δι' ἀναστάδος.

i 888, ἀπηρέσιν for ἀπήμοσιν.

i 967, εἰσάμενοι for στησάμενοι.

i 1036, δὲ περὶ for γὰρ περὶ, further corrupted in some MSS. to γάρ τοι or περὶ γάρ.

i 1250, δίεσθαι for νέεσθαι.

ii 296, σώεσθαι for σεύεσθαι or σέβεσθαι.

ii 908, ηὐλίζετο for εὐνάζετο.

iii 201, πρόμαλοι for πρόμαδοι.

And I believe it is also right at i 1135 with εἰλίσσοντο for ὠρχήσαντο; the imperfect is the better tense there and ὠρχήσαντο is more likely a gloss on εἰλίσσοντο than the other way about; cf. too Tryphiodorus 342. These passages should be carefully studied by any over fervid admirer of our MSS.

On page 64 of his *Prolegomena*, Merkel says: "manifestum scripturas ἐν δ' ἄρα τοίγε codicis Guelf. et νῆα χυτῷ λιμένι olim coniunctas fuisse, alteram ex corruptela Laurentiani irrepsisse in Guelf. et in scholia." If then he reads himself by conjecture ἐκ δ' ἄρα τοίγε νῆα Χυτὸν λιμένα, I suppose it can only be because he could not believe in the construction ἐξήλασαν ὅρμου ἐν λιμένι. It seems however possible for Ap., meaning: "They were in the harbour, having rowed out from the former anchorage." (There is no distinction in this passage between λιμὴν and ὅρμος.) Some other passages are something like this, though none quite so strange. At ii 727 ἠῶθεν ἀνέμοιο διὰ κνέφας εὐνηθέντος means: "the wind having dropped at dawn after blowing all night." ii 805, ὄφρ' αὐτοῖο ποτὶ στόμα: "until <you come> to the mouth." iv 1316, αὐτὸν ἀμφαδὸν οἷον προσέειπον: "they spoke to him appearing to him alone." If a man can say things like that, he might say ἐν λιμένι ἐξήλασαν ὅρμου. At any rate that is the reading we must start from.

i 989. γηγενέες δ' ἑτέρωθεν ἀπ' οὔρεος ἀίξαντες
φράξαν ἀπειρεσίοιο Χυτοῦ στόμα νειόθι πέτρης.

The epithet *ἀπειρεσίοιο* cannot be applied to a harbour: if the word is right it must be taken with *οὔρεος*, but the order of the words is desperately against this, and it seems a strange epithet even for *οὔρεος*. It must be admitted however that Ap. does use it very freely. But I have a strong suspicion that he wrote *ἀπειρεσίῃσι*.

No doubt the *πέτραι* were not as big as the *οὖρος*. But yet it is more natural to say "coming from the mountain they blocked up the harbour with enormous rocks" than to say "coming from the enormous mountain &c."

Quintus i 688 has *ἀπειρέσιοι πόδες Ἴδης*, but at ii 380 *πέτρου ἀπειρεσίοιο*, at viii 164 *ἀπειρεσίην πέτρην*.

i 1059. *τρὶς περὶ χαλκείοις δίχα τεύχεσι δινηθέντες*
τύμβῳ ἐνεκτερέιξαν.

δίχα is read by one Vatican MS. and is the reading of the scholiast; the rest have *σύν*, in which the editors acquiesce, I suppose from sheer despair. For if *σὺν* is right where does this *δίχα* come from? On the face of it *δίχα* is unconstruable, and somebody long ago altered it to *σύν*. After much worrying over it I found the explanation in ii 36, *ἶζον ἑοὺς δίχα πάντας ἐνὶ ψαμάθοισιν ἑταίρους*, "they set down all their comrades in two bands." So here also "thrice with bronze arms did they march round the body in two bands," because the Argonauts and the Cyzicenes are both paying funeral honours to Cyzicus and march in two separate processions.

So too at iv 949:

παρθενικαὶ δίχα κόλπον ἐπ' ἰξύας εἱλίξασαι
σφαίρῃ ἀθύρουσιν περιηγέι.

This does not mean that they each separately roll up their skirts, but that they divide into two sides to play.

i 1226. *αἱ μὲν, ὅσαι σκοπιὰς ὀρέων λάχον ἢ καὶ ἐναύλους,*
αἵ γε μὲν ὑλήωροι ἀπόπροθεν ἐστιχόωντο,
ἡ δὲ νέον κρήνης ἀνεδύνετο καλλινάοιο
νύμφη ἐφυδατίη.

Ziegler may be right in saying: "Vulgata scriptura non emendatione sed interpretatione indiget," but he does not

know what it means himself. He wants us to believe that γε μὲν is merely resumptive, "*they*, I say," and that ὑλήωροι means exactly the same as ὅσαι σκοπιὰς λάχον ἢ καὶ ἐναύλους. But γε μὲν is never resumptive, σκοπιαὶ are essentially unwooded, and cave-nymphs are not the same as wood-nymphs. Compare the three classes of nymphs mentioned at iv 1149. And γε μὲν in Ap. sometimes means simply "again" or "and," as γε μὴν does so often in Xenophon; see e.g. iii 1093, iv 1092, 1466. So here the meaning is: "On the one hand the nymphs of the peaks and caves, and again those of the woods, came from afar, but the water-nymph was just coming out of her spring (near at hand)."

i 1333. πέρι γάρ μ' ἄχος εἶλεν ἐνισπεῖν
μῦθον ὑπερφίαλόν τε καὶ ἄσχετον.

ἦκεν LG, but εἶλεν is written over ἦκεν in L and is the reading of the Vatican MSS. Merkel, supposing ἦκεν to come from ἵκω, proposed ἶκεν which in that case would be the right epic form. εἶλεν seems to me strange, as it does to Mr Mooney who suggests εἶλκεν, and I should prefer to keep ἦκεν as the aorist of ἵημι. Cf. ξ 464. On the other hand ἄχος εἶλεν often go together.

i 1338. φὰς ἐνὶ τοῖσιν ἅπασιν.

"Saying in the presence of all these." τοῖσιν cannot mean that; read τοισίδ'. This form is only found in one other place, ii 1163, but if a poet can use a form once he can use it twice.

ii 8. χρειώ μιν ἐρέσθαι.

Ap. is accused of using μιν here as a plural. But both the MSS. and the scholia are divided, some reading μὲν and some μιν. Though his sins against Homer are as scarlet, yet in this matter he is white as wool; at iv 1209 the right and best supported reading, τρομέοντες, enables us to take μιν as a singular; if he had believed in a plural μιν he would probably have used it several times, as he does with μεταχρόνιος and other oddities. Here μὲν is plainly right, for it is demanded by the answering δὲ of 10.

ii 75. *ὁ δ' ἄρ' αἰὲν ἀνούτατος ἦν διὰ μῆτιν*
ἀίσσοντ' ἀλέεινεν· ἀπηνέα δ' αἶψα νοήσας
πυγμαχίην, ᾗ κάρτος ἀάατος ᾗ τε χερείων,
στῆ ῥ' ἄμοτον καὶ χερσὶν ἐναντία χεῖρας ἔμιξεν.

The translators make wild work of this because they do not distinguish between an imperfect and an aorist. Polydeuces *kept on* breaking ground before the impetuous attack of Amycus for a time, but after soon finding out his strong and weak points he then *took up* a firm position against him and then first engaged in hand-to-hand conflict. *στῆ* should never mean "stood" but "took up a position," and Ap. always uses it correctly.

ii 93. *ὤμῳ δ' ἀνεδέξατο πῆχυν*
τυτθόν· ὁ δ' ἄγχ' αὐτοῖο παρὲκ γόνυ γουνὸς ἀμείβων
κόψε μεταΐγδην ὑπὲρ οὖατος.

Köchly on the strength of a very similar passage in Quintus iv 345, quoted in Mr Mooney's note, proposed to read *πῆχυν· τυτθὸν δ' ἄγχ' αὐτοῖο*, and Merkel follows him. When Merkel follows Köchly any one with any modesty in him must think a great deal before declining to follow them in turn and must have very good reasons to produce if he does decline. At first sight I confess I thought the change unnecessary, as Köchly's changes certainly are sometimes, but on looking closer I see that it is fully justified. Amycus aimed a blow at Polydeuces. *ὁ δὲ ὤμῳ ἀνεδέξατο πῆχυν. ὁ δὲ* is of course Polydeuces. Then comes another *ὁ δὲ* which again of course must mean Amycus; it is not the habit of Ap. to use *ὁ δὲ* without changing the subject. But not a bit of it; one is surprised to find that *ὁ δὲ* is Polydeuces again! Then too I could not long persuade myself that *τυτθὸν* can mean anything whatever as our text stands. For three distinct reasons therefore Köchly must be allowed to be right.

ii 159. *ξανθὰ δ' ἐρεψάμενοι δάφνῃ καθύπερθε μέτωπα*
ἀγχιάλῳ τῇ καὶ τῇ περὶ πρυμνήσι' ἀνῆπτο.

No conjecture yet proposed is adequate: Mr Mooney's is perhaps the best, *τῇ, ἄκτῃ ἔπι*, "where upon the beach." But the metre of this is dubious, *ἄκτῃ ἔπι* is worse than superfluous

after *ἀγχιάλῳ*, and the repetition of *ἀκτὴ* in 162 is displeasing. If we write *τῆπερ καὶ δὴ* we shall get the right sense with very little change of letters. Ap. twice elsewhere uses *καὶ δὴ* for *ἤδη*, as do so many other writers both in verse and prose, though L. and S. ignore this use; see i 1161, ii 1030. Cf. iv 644, *τὴν οἶμον τῆπέρ τε καὶ ἔπλετο νόστος ἰοῦσιν*, iii 577, *τόθι περ καὶ πρόσθε κάθιζον*.

Just below "Therapnaean son of Zeus" is not Polydeuces but Apollo. Consider the *δάφνη*. And it is not likely that they would be singing a *hymn* (*ὕμνον ἄειδον*) to Polydeuces with him sitting there as one of them.

ii 173. *λάβρον ἐπικρέμαται ὑπὲρ νέφεος. ἀλλὰ τό γ' ἔμπης.*

So L, *ὑπὲρ νέφος* G. The subject of *ἐπικρέμαται* is *κῦμα*, and the *κῦμα* has just been described as *ἐναλίγκιον οὔρει*. It is very easy to emend *ὑπὲρ νέφεος* to *καθάπερ νέφος*, and that course has been taken by some inferior MSS. But to say first that a wave is like a mountain and in the same breath that it hangs over the ship like a cloud! "Very like a whale" would be just as good. It is quite right to accept good readings from the Paris MSS., but I do not see why we should accept bad ones. Merkel's *ὑπερηρεφὲς* seems to me pretty certain; at any rate it is better than *καθάπερ νέφος*.

ii 176. *ἤματι δ' ἄλλῳ.*

"Next day." For this use of *ἄλλος* cf. Xen. *Hell.* I i 13, *τῇ ἄλλῃ ἡμέρᾳ*, I ii 1, *τῷ ἄλλῳ ἔτει*, *Anab.* II i 3, III iv 1, VI i 15.

ii 246. *ἦ ῥα θεοὺς ὀλοῇσι παρήλιτες ἀφραδίῃσιν;*

ἀτροπίῃσιν is the reading of G, is added by the second hand in L, is the reading of the scholia, and—is not read by modern editors! *ἀφραδίῃσιν* is surely a manifest gloss, even if it were better supported than it is, but the weight of external evidence also is greatly in favour of *ἀτροπίῃσιν*. At iv 1082 the scholia mention a variant *ἀτροπίῃσιν* for *ἀμπλακίῃσιν*; it is much harder then to decide, but again on the face of it *ἀμπλακίῃσιν* is the gloss and *ἀτροπίῃσιν* suits the context better.

ii 248. *ἄμμι γε μὴν νόος ἔνδον ἀτύζεται ἱεμένοισιν*
χραισμεῖν, εἰ δὴ πρόχνυ γέρας τόδε πάρθετο δαίμων
νῶιν. ἀρίζηλοι γὰρ ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἐνιπαὶ
ἀθανάτων.

Surely *ἀρίζηλοι* is a simple error for *ἀτυζηλοί*. The Scholiast tries feebly to explain the sentence by talking about a hyperbaton. I can do better than that myself; "the rebuke of God is plain, for it means a vengeance all men can see, and therefore we are frightened." Then too what does the stopping of the editions mean? what in the name of the immortals is the connexion of the whole passage? It is easy enough: *νόος ἔνδον ἀτύζεται, (ἱεμένοισιν χραισμεῖν εἰ δὴ...νῶιν), ἀτυζηλοὶ γὰρ κτλ.*

I think the corruption is older than Quintus, for *ἀρίδηλον ὁμοκλὴν* in him (xiv 442) looks like a reminiscence of this passage. If so he took *ἀρίζηλος* to mean "terrible," confusing it with *ἀίδηλος* (see Leaf on B 318). But Ap. uses *ἀρίζηλος* correctly (iii 958).

ii 260. *δαίμονες, οἳ μηδ' ὧδε θανόντι περ εὐμενέοιεν.*

οἵδε L, *ὧδε* Pariss. "*ὧδε*: *ἐπιόρκως*. Schol." says Mr Mooney, but this is misleading. The Laurentian scholia say nothing of the sort; they read and try to explain *οἵδε*. The Parisian scholia may try to explain the Parisian reading if they like, but they cannot; if *ὧδε* mean *ἐπιόρκως*, then *μηδ' ὧδε θανόντι περ* can only mean "not even if I die with perjury on my lips," and a nice thing to say that is. Obviously we want "not even in death." And we must start from *οἳ μηδ' οἵδε*. Herwerden has put it all straight with *οἵ μοι μηδέ*.

ii 368. *λευκῆσιν ἑλίσσεται εἰς ἅλα δίναις.*

λευκῆσιν is a curious epithet for a river. I take it that it means something like *chalky*. Mr Garwood tells me that there is no chalk proper in Asia minor, but that there are limestone formations which would account for the colour of the water. Only I cannot find out about this particular river, the Iris; perhaps some traveller will bear the point in mind and inform us. Dionysius, *Orbis Descrip.* 783, says: *Ἶρις δ' ἐξείης*

καθαρὸν ῥόον εἰς ἅλα βάλλει, and that the neighbouring Thermodon λευκὸν ὕδωρ προΐησιν. So he too uses λευκὸν of the water in this district. But it may only mean "transparent."

ii 381. δουρατέοις πύργοισιν ἐν οἰκία τεκτήναντες
κάλινα καὶ πύργους εὐπηγέας, οὓς καλέουσιν
μόσσυνας· καὶ δ' αὐτοὶ ἐπώνυμοι ἔνθεν ἔασιν.

This is a description of the Mossynoeci; there are two real difficulties about the passage, first that the repetition πύργοισιν...πύργους is impossible, secondly that 383 is repeated after 1016:

ἦ ἔνι Μοσσύνοικοι ἀν' οὔρεα ναιετάουσιν
μόσσυνας· καὶ δ' αὐτοὶ ἐπώνυμοι ἔνθεν ἔασιν.

To these Brunck adds an imaginary difficulty, that 382 and 383, occurring as they do in a prophetic account of the voyage given by Phineus, are out of place; a prophet ought not to give etymologies nor go into details, but leave such things to the poet's later and fuller account of the events when he comes to them again. Most editors however follow Brunck in bracketing the two lines and regarding 1017 as genuine. I think the truth lies in the opposite direction.

Brunck's objection, as I have said, seems to me imaginary; nobody would have thought of making it had there not been the two real difficulties. Perhaps Ap. *ought* not to have put the words in the prophet's mouth, but if you begin cutting out everything Ap. ought not to have said where is it to end? Why, at 385 Phineus digresses to make irrelevant remarks about the Amazons, and at 353 he has already added four lines out of a guide-book. Besides I do not admit at all that there is any good poetic reason why Phineus should not have spoken the lines; it is not true that a preliminary account of this kind need be brief, nor need it avoid details of any sort the poet pleases; just look at the long speech of Circe to Odysseus in μ.

On the contrary one would expect the poet to explain the name Mossynoeci the first time it is mentioned, not to wait till the second. So Circe gives Odysseus the etymology of

Scylla; Homer did not think it his business to wait to tell that till Odysseus actually met her. Homer is a better authority on the point than Brunck.

If we examine the lines in themselves critically, we shall come to the same conclusion; it is 1017 that ought to go. For if you omit 382 and 383, then 381 is left stranded and absurd:

δουρατέοις πύργοισιν ἐν οἰκία τεκτήναντες.

What does this mean? who ever built houses inside towers? and what were the houses themselves made of? And there is no point in putting in 381 at all unless it is to lead up to the explanation of the name Mossynoeci, so that if the other two lines go it ought to go with them.

Again 1017 comes in badly where it does and does not improve the construction, for Ap. prefers to use ναιετάω without an accusative. Whereas μόσσυνας is explained as a foreign name in 382, οὓς καλέουσιν μόσσυνας, it is treated in 1017 as if it were Greek.

I conclude therefore that 382 and 383 are genuine and that 1017 should be ejected.

It remains then to consider the other problem; is πύργοισιν in 381 or πύργους in 382 the corrupt word? Ruhnken and Merkel both seek to emend the latter; again I am constrained to disagree. As said above, "building houses in towers" is absurd; therefore it is πύργοισιν that is wrong. And what does μόσσυνας mean? Towers, of course; therefore it is πύργους that is right. The meaning we want is plainly "building houses of wood inside wooden walls, and building towers which they call etc." For πύργοισιν then we should restore τείχεσσιν.

ii 385 τῇ μέν τ' ἐνὶ νηὸν Ἄρηος
λαΐνεον ποίησαν Ἀμαζονίδων βασίλειαι
Ὀτρηρή τε καὶ Ἀντιόπη, ὁπότε στρατόωντο.

A line must have dropped out after this, for no poet would ever say "they built an altar there when they were going on a campaign" without saying against whom.

If we read ὁπότ' ἐστρατόωντο we escape violating the rule

that if there is a strong caesura in the fifth foot there should be a weak one in the third (Mooney, p. 415). To that rule however I have noted thirteen exceptions in the *Argonautica*, besides this line.

ii 390. *ἰσχέμεν. ἀλλὰ τίη με πάλιν χρειὼ ἀλιτέσθαι.*

This line again breaks a subtle rule of Merkel's, that if the fourth foot be a spondee its thesis should be part of a word, or of a phrase hanging closely together, containing more than two syllables. This is certainly observed generally by Apollonius. Now here *πάλιν χρειὼ* does not hang closely together. Perhaps *χρέω ἔστ' ἀλιτέσθαι*; cf. ii 817, *ἐπεὶ χρέω ἦγε δαμῆναι*, iv 1164, *τοτ' αὖ χρέω ἦγε μιγῆναι*. But the rule is not absolute enough to insist on.

ii 552. *πολλὸν δὲ φόβῳ προτέρωσε νέοντο.*

This phrase entirely ruins by anticipation the effect of 561; there is nothing yet to be frightened at, and 555—559 represent the crew as quite calm. Then too what is the sense just here of saying that they went a long way forward? Something is seriously wrong, but I cannot see the remedy. *πολλῷ δὲ πόνῳ* for example would give the sort of sense required.

ii 590. *ὅσσον δ' ἂν ὑπείκαθε νηῦς ἐρέτῃσιν,*
δὶς τόσον ἂψ ἀπόρουσεν.

There are two reasons why this will not do. The only way to explain *ἂν* is to say that it is iterative, but the iterative *ἂν* does not occur in Ap. and I do not think that it is epic at all; it is certainly not Homeric. Secondly, *ἀπόρουσεν* is then the wrong tense, it should be *ἀπόρουεν*. Read then *ὅσσον δ' ὑποείκαθε*, which is of course an aorist; Ap. is very fond of not eliding the prepositions in such compounds; cf. Mr Mooney's excellent restoration of *ὑποέσχεθε* at iv 1562. This is I think better than Herwerden's *δ' ἄρ' ὑπείκαθε* though *ἄρ' ἰοῦσαν* is corrupted to *ἀνιοῦσαν* in one MS. at iii 1155, *ἄρα* to *ἀνὰ* in four MSS. at iii 198, and *ἄρ'* to *ἂν* in I know not how many at i 416. Here I suppose that *δ' ὑπείκαθε* was first written wrongly and then the gap was filled up recklessly in some ancestor of all our MSS.

ii 593. *ἔνθεν δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα κατηρεφὲς ἔσσυτο κῦμα,*
ἡ δ' ἄφαρ ὥστε κύλινδρος ἐπέτρεχε κύματι λάβρῳ
προπροκαταΐγδην κοίλης ἁλός.

Argo has just been carried back by a wave from the rocks; now a counter-wave "from the other side" (*ἔνθεν δ'*) carries them back again. *ὥστε κύλινδρος*, that is *broadside on*, the way a cylinder rolls; "she was swept by the wave, broadside on, down *into* the trough of the sea." *ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσαις Πληγάσι δινήεις εἶχεν ῥόος.* "But of course (*ἄρα*, as things always *will* go wrong) the current held her up right between the rocks," *αἱ δ' ἑκάτερθεν σειόμεναι βρόμεον· πεπέδητο δὲ νήια δοῦρα.* As the ship had gone in sideways, *ὥστε κύλινδρος*, both prow and stern got caught by the rocks at each end; *νήια δοῦρα* means more than *νηῦς*, and the reason for this amplification is that Ap. means "both ends of the ship"; *πεπέδητο* again must mean much more than "were stayed," else this would be a mere repetition of *εἶχεν ῥόος*: it means that they "got caught." Being thus fettered prow and stern, nothing could have saved them but divine intervention, *καὶ τότ' Ἀθηναίη στιβαρῇς ἀντέσπασε πέτρης σκαιῇ*. "with her left hand plucked away the ship from her entanglement in the rock"; *ἀντέσπασε πέτρης* can no more mean "pushed back the rock" or "clung to the rock" then *ἀντέσπασε ξίφους* could mean "pushed back his sword" or "clung to it." *πέτρης* is an ablatival genitive; it is obvious that to pull away, say, the stern from one rock would automatically free the prow from the other, and so the singular *πέτρης* is quite enough. *ἀντὶ* means "back," as often in compounds. Compare too i 1313, *στιβαρῇ ἐπορέξατο χειρὶ νηίου ὁλκαίοιο* (which does not mean the ship's keel).

Not only has all this been misinterpreted, but in 600 *μετήορος* of course means "on the crest of the wave," and in 602 *νωλεμὲς ἐμπλήξασαι* (not *ἐμπλήσσουσαι*) means "clashing violently." Ap. knew no more than I do what is the derivation of *νωλεμες*, but that is the sort of sense he here attaches to it. So again in 605 *νωλεμὲς ἐρρίζωθεν* means "were strongly rooted." Cf. Theocr. xxv 113.

ii 874. *ὣς δὲ καὶ ὤλλοι δεῦρο δαήμονες ἄνδρες ἔασιν.*

Ancaeus could not have said that *all* the other sailors were skilled pilots; read *ἄλλοι* (Brunck). Jason says just after that there were *many* pilots; only three actually put in for the post besides Ancaeus.

ii 933. *ἠύτε τίς τε δι᾽ ἠέρος ὑψόθι κίρκος*
ταρσὸν ἐφειὶς πνοιῇ φέρεται ταχύς, οὐδὲ τινάσσει
ῥιπήν, εὐκήλοισιν ἐνευδιόων πτερύγεσσιν.

These beautiful lines seem to me superior to Virgil's better known imitation (*Aen.* v 217); they are at any rate more correct, for this wheeling flight *with unmoved wings* is particularly characteristic of birds of prey, not of pigeons. White speaks of Virgil's "engaging numbers" (*Selborne*, letter 94); I think he would have admitted the superiority of Apollonius at least as an observer of birds, and "celeres neque commovet alas" is pale indeed beside *εὐκήλοισιν ἐνευδιόων πτερύγεσσιν.*

ii 1073. *ὡς δ᾽ ὅτε τις κεράμῳ κατερέψεται ἐρκίον ἀνήρ,*
δώματος ἀγλαΐην τε καὶ ὑετοῦ ἔμμεναι ἄλκαρ.

The authorities say that *ἐρκίον* here means a building, and certainly that is suggested by the second line. But *ἐρκίον* equally certainly should mean nothing but a wall. Mr Ernest Gardner suggests to me that Ap. is thinking of a mud wall, which has to be protected at the top either by planting shrubs upon it or by tiling it over, to prevent the rain washing it away. Cf. Dr Leaf's *Troy*, p. 54. This seems to suit the passage quite well; by tiling the wall of his garden or court, the man improves the look of his premises and protects the wall from the rain.

ii 1126. *νηὸς ἀεικελίης διὰ δούρατα πάντ᾽ ἐκέδασσαν.*

There is no need to suppose that their ship was a bad one when it started from Colchis. *ἀεικελίης* is only a hypallage for *ἀεικελίως*, Ap. being very fond of this figure. Or you can call it predicative if you prefer it. The opposite hypallage occurs at 1275, *ἐναίσιμα πείσματα δέχθαι.* At iii 342 *αἰνοτάτης* should be explained in the same way, "with dreadful bad luck."

ii 1170. *μῆλ' ἱερευσόμενοι· περὶ δ' ἐσχάρῃ ἐστήσαντο.*

"Placed themselves," says Mr Mooney. This seems perhaps the most likely interpretation, for it would certainly be odd to say that they arranged the sheep round the altar. Yet at first sight it seems strong measure to accuse Ap. of such a piece of grammar; we must however remember that he doubtless had *περιστήσαντο* in his text of Homer B 410, *μ* 356, and that he may have held *στησάμενοι* to be intransitive in the formula *στησάμενοι δ' ἐμάχοντο μάχην.*

ii 1212. *στιβαρὰς ἐπορέξατο χεῖρας.*

I had intended to quote this in defence of the true explanation of Ω 506 (*Journ. Phil.* no. 63, p. 30),

ἀνδρὸς παιδοφόνοιο ποτὶ στόμα χεῖρ' ὀρέγεσθαι,

but unluckily forget it. It seems to shew that Ap. took the Homeric passage to mean "stretch out my hand." It is the only instance of this use of the middle in him, as Merkel has corrected ii 829 rightly.

ii 1220, iv 1778. *οὔτε* makes no grammar; read *οὐδέ.*

ii 1250. *αἰετὸν ἧπατι φέρβε παλιμπετὲς ἀίσσοντα.*

We do not want attention called to the fact that the eagle returns to his daily liver, for birds naturally come where they are fed, but to the really remarkable phenomenon that the liver grew afresh. Even Quintus knows that (v 344). Then too *παλιμπετὲς ἀίσσοντα*, as applied to the eagle, ought to mean "springing backwards"; cf. iv 106 and Quintus iv 366. And then to end 1258 with *αὖτις ἀπ' οὔρεος ἀίσσοντα*, which *does* refer to the eagle flying back from Prometheus!

Pindar uses *ἀίσσω* of the growth of a tree, and he uses it as a synonym of *αὔξεσθαι* (*Nem.* viii 40). Did Ap. say here *ἀίσσοντι*? If the word refers to the eagle we want something like *ἐπ' αὐτὸν* added; if it refers to the liver, then "shooting back" is sufficient, though it may not be a pretty phrase.

ii 1251. *τὸν μὲν ἐπ' ἀκροτάτης ἴδον ἕσπερον ὀξέι ῥοίζῳ*
νηὸς ὑπερπτάμενον νεφέων σχεδόν.

This is supposed to mean that the Argonauts saw the eagle of Prometheus flying just over the top of the ship at evening.

But ἐπὶ νηὸς cannot mean "over the ship" and ἕσπερον cannot mean "at evening." Mr Mooney defends the latter by a reference to 406:

οὐδέ οἱ ἦμαρ,
οὐ κνέφας ἥδυμος ὕπνος ἀναιδέα δάμναται ὄσσε.

There κνέφας is accusative by a common idiom enough; "he is awake all night" is an accusative of duration of time, and if that is put in a negative form the poets often use a negative with an accusative instead of genitive by a sort of attraction into the wrong case. But it does not follow that because we can say οὐ κνέφας εὕδει we can therefore say κνέφας εὕδει in any sense except: "he sleeps *all* night." In fact ἕσπερον meaning "*at* evening" is indefensible.

Read ἑσπέρου, comparing iv 1289 for the gender. Also Pindar, *Pyth.* xi 18, ἄκρᾳ σὺν ἑσπέρᾳ, and ἀκρέσπερος.

There are however some accusatives of time in Ap. which deserve attention. iv 869:

ἡ μὲν γὰρ βροτέας αἰεὶ περὶ σάρκας ἔδαιεν
νύκτα διὰ μέσσην φλογμῷ πυρός· ἤματα δ' αὖτε
ἀμβροσίῃ χρίεσκε τέρεν δέμας.

Here ἤματα means ὁσήμεραι; it is neither governed by διὰ nor altogether due to attraction to νύκτα, but is the same as πάντ' ἤματα at iv 648, and is explained by the fact that the poet means ἤματι but is influenced by the number of separate days extending over a period.

iii 1079, οὐ νύκτας οὐδέ ποτ' ἦμαρ is like ii 406 above quoted.

For iii 417, δείελον ὥρην and iii 899, αὐτὴν ὥρην, see *Journ. Phil.* no. 62, p. 234. To the instances there given add the following: τὴν ὥρην or ὥραν, Hdt. ii 2, Lucian *Somn.* 7, Plut. *Quaest. Symp.* 667 D, τὴν ὥραν τοῦ ἔτους, Demosth. iv 32, ὥρην τοῦ ἔτεος καλλίστην, Hdt. vii 50, ταύτην τὴν ὥραν, Theophrast. frag. vii 11, τὴν χειμερίνην ὥρην, Hdt. ii 24, νυκτερινὴν ὥρην, *Anth. Pal.* xii 250, πᾶσαν ὥραν, Aristot. *Gen. An.* 770ª 13. All these go under the three heads given in the article referred to. I there also quoted two passages where the accusative of ἡμέραν is used in the same way with a

pronoun; this also is quite common, see Hdt. iii 55, v 112, vii 55, 181, viii 86, 107, [Demosth.] xxv 11, all these with *ταύτην*; in Hdt. vii 203 we have *πᾶσαν ἡμέρην* like Aristotle's favourite *πᾶσαν ὥραν*, and in Homer K 497 *τὴν* (= *κείνην*) *νύκτα*. Ap. imitated this at i 278, *κεῖν' ἦμαρ*. And Herodotus is fond of so using *χρόνον*; thus we have *τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον* in i 75, iv 152, v 44, viii 65, and *τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον χρόνον* in vii 151.

ii 1265. *εἰσέλασαν ποταμοῖο μέγαν ῥόον· αὐτὰρ ὁ πάντῃ*
καχλάζων ὑπόεικεν.

Who would ever say that the water of a river gave way to a boat *everywhere*? Read *αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἄντην*, comparing i 370, *ῥοθίοιο βίην ἔχοι ἀντιόωσαν*. Phrases like *αὐτὰρ ὅ γε* are extremely common in Ap. from i 26 onwards.

iii 12. *τί χρέος; ἠὲ δόλον τινὰ μήσεαι...*

Read of course *τί χρέος; ἠὲ δόλον τίνα*...and in 14 *ἤ* for *ἦ*.

iii 33. *οὐδέ τινα χρειὼ θελκτήριον οἶδα πόθοιο.*

People do not quite know what to make of *χρειὼ* and no wonder. Combined with *θελκτήριον* it is intolerable. We want a word meaning something like *sting* or *charm*, if *θελκτήριον* is an adjective; if it is a noun, we want a genitive to agree with *πόθοιο*. *οὐδέ τιν' ἀχρείου θελκτήρια* might suit Athena's contempt for the sentimental.

iii 45. *λευκοῖσιν δ' ἑκάτερθε κόμας ἐπιειμένη ὤμοις.*

One can say *κόμας ἐπιειμένη* = clothed in hair, but how can one add *ὤμοις*? "Local" says Mr Mooney, as if it were like *δόμοις*, and compares iv 179: *λαιῷ ἐπιειμένος ὤμῳ*, where Jason carries the fleece on his left shoulder, and where the same difficulty crops up again. In both lines I believe that the participle is the perfect from *ἐφίημι*. Ap. certainly uses this form (i 939, etc.) and the meaning suits both places. For iii 45 compare iii 830 where *καταειμέναι* again refers to the hair and undoubtedly means "let down." And at iv 179 it is much better to say, "now throwing it over his shoulder, now rolling it up into a ball," than "now clothed with it, etc."

iii 74. οὐδέ κε λώβην
τίσειεν Πελίας, εἰ μὴ σύ γε νόστον ὀπάσσῃς.

So L, vulg., ὀπάσσεις G, more likely by accident or interpolation than anything else, ὀπάσσοις Paris. unus. Authority is worth little enough with such terminations in epic verse, but plainly ὀπάσσῃς should be kept so far as authority goes. But Mr Mooney calls it a solecism. Brunck altered some other alleged solecisms of the same kind, but modern editors have justly thrown him over and gone back to the MSS. In late epic there can hardly be said to be such a thing as a solecism in the use of subjunctives and optatives; Ap. seems to think that there is no more difference between them than between a chaconne and a passacaglia. εἰ with the subjunctive is common in him, and he often makes a subjunctive follow an optative. Does the solecism consist in a subjunctive after a κεν clause? What then of i 244, iii 437? Only five lines on we have μὴ πέλοιτο, εἰ δὴ ἀθερίζω, which Mr Mooney takes to be present subjunctive, for he translates "if I should scorn." In this confusion of moods I do not see how we can deny the possibility of ὀπάσσῃς.

iii 158. βῆ δὲ διὲκ μεγάροιο Διὸς πάγκαρπον ἀλωήν·
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα πύλας ἐξήλυθεν Οὐλύμποιο
αἰθερίας· ἔνθεν δὲ καταιβάτις ἐστὶ κέλευθος
οὐρανίη· δοίω δὲ πόλοι ἀνέχουσι κάρηνα
οὐρέων ἠλιβάτων, κορυφαὶ χθονός, ᾗχί τ' ἀερθεὶς
ἠέλιος πρώτῃσιν ἐρεύθεται ἀκτίνεσσιν.

"He went through the fruitful garden of the palace of Zeus, and then went out through the gates of Heaven; thence is a way down, and two poles hold up the heads of high mountains" (or "two poles stick up, being heads of mountains") "where the sun rises." Does the sun rise at the north pole or the south pole? How can the poles hold up mountains, or how can they be described as being themselves mountains? And how could Eros be at both poles at once? All that is wrong with the passage is a single letter. Read πόλον. "Two high peaks uphold the sky, where the sun rises."

The two peaks I take to be a poetical shadow or reflection

of that half-legendary mountain called by Aristotle Parnasus, which is admitted to be the greatest mountain *τῶν πρὸς τὴν ἕω τὴν χειμερινήν*, and of that other almost equally legendary called Caucasus which is the greatest *τῶν πρὸς τὴν ἕω τὴν θερινὴν καὶ πλήθει καὶ ὕψει*. See the whole passage, *Meteor.* i 350ª 18—33. We have here two mountains on the verge of the world, *ὑπερβάντι γὰρ ἤδη τοῦτο* (Parnasus) *φαίνεται ἡ ἔξω θάλαττα*, both of gigantic size, spoken of by Aristotle as if they were about in the same longitude, one on the north, the other on the south of the morning. Between these the sun would rise, and they might be supposed to hold up the sky there as Atlas holds up the pillars of heaven in the west, *ἔχει δέ τε κίονας αὐτός* (*a* 54), not one pillar but two.

It is true that the East which Aristotle knew so little of had been thrown open by Alexander and that Apollonius ought to have known better. But what do poets care about these things, especially a poet like Ap., smothered in the dust of his library and grossly ignorant of the geography of even the Aegean? Milton knew very well that the Copernican cosmology was the true one, but he stuck to the Ptolemaic for his own purposes. Of course my identification of these two Apollonian mountains with Aristotle's is speculative; it is the only suggestion I can make, and I believe it to be correct myself, but if any one can find any better explanation, all the better. That we should read *πόλον* I do feel quite sure.

I have translated *μεγάροιο Διὸς* in 158, but the more I think about it the more am I persuaded that Gerhard's *μεγάλοιο* is right. The epithet may be otiose, but so are the epithets *ἠριγένεια* and *ῥοδοδάκτυλος* in a well-known line, and a nice state will poetry fall into if poets may not put in any adjectives they please. *διὲκ μεγάροιο* cannot go together because of the context, nor can *μεγάροιο ἀλωὴν* go together really because "the orchard of the palace of Zeus" is one of those things a decent poet does not say.

Considering therefore this line by itself we see that *μεγάλοιο* is necessary, and to clinch the matter still more closely compare i 1315, where *παρὲκ μεγάλοιο Διὸς* stands in exactly the same part of the line, and *μεγάλοιο Διὸς* is also in the

same position in Quintus ii 524, viii 354, xii 386, xiii 512, 560. Otiose in every one of them!

Cf. too Quintus x 335, *ὅπῃ Διὸς ἔπλετ' ἀλωή.*

iii 164. *νειόθι δ' ἄλλοτε γαῖα φερέσβιος ἄστεά τ' ἀνδρῶν*
φαίνετο καὶ ποταμῶν ἱεροὶ ῥόοι, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
ἄκριες, ἀμφὶ δὲ πόντος ἀν' αἰθέρι πολλὸν ἰόντι.

ἀν' αἰθέρι LG, *ἐν αἰθέρι* vel *ἀν' αἰθέρα* al. The scholiast knows no reading but *ἀν' αἰθέρι* and tries desperately to explain it as dative for accusative. We are bound to start from it in considering the passage.

Now Ap. does use *ἀνὰ* with a dative, for no one would deny this at ii 699, *ἀνὰ δίπλοα μηρία βωμῷ*, unless he were defending a thesis. If *ἀν' αἰθέρι* is right here it means "standing on the top of the aether," as Eros is doing. But if so, what can be made of *πολλὸν ἰόντι*? Nothing, and therefore editors adopt *αἰθέρα*. Having got it, they are not much better off, for *ἀν' αἰθέρα πολλὸν ἰόντι* cannot be right; it seems to be supposed to mean: "as Eros flew down through the aether," but *ἰέναι ἀν' αἰθέρα* cannot mean that; it could only mean "to go over aether," and that of course will not do. Or is it perhaps supposed that Eros starts in a straight line parallel to the earth below him and then drops like a hawk when he gets above Colchis? *ἀν' αἰθέρα* might then mean "going along the aether" as if it were a road. But I do not find that suggestion made, and the idea would be contrary to epic custom; gods always begin by flying down to earth. Besides *ἀνὰ* ought then to mean "up."

If therefore we seek refuge with inferior MSS., as we often do rightly enough, we are not much the better here.

What strikes me forcibly about the whole passage is that we do not want any talk about "going" at all. We expect to be told that as Eros stood there he had a magnificent panorama spread out below. Milton, I believe, follows this passage in *Paradise Lost* v 252—261 and the still more splendid scene beginning at iii 540. In each case he lays stress upon the spectator seeing the view outstretched below him; at iii 555 he says what you would expect Ap. to say here:

"*Round he surveys*, and well might, *where he stood*
So high above the circling Canopie
Of Nights extended shade."

παπταίνει ἀνὰ αἰθέρι ἑστηκώς. What Milton says is not evidence, and to read παπταίνοντι for πολλὸν ἰόντι is not palaeography, but I cannot resist the suspicion that that is what Ap. said. At any rate the text is wrong.

For the construction of ἀν' αἰθέρι παπταίνω cf. ii 1056 : δούπει ἐπὶ σκοπιῆς, "he made a noise standing on a peak."

It should be added (1) that ἄλλοτε suits just as well with the notion of *looking* as of *flying*, (2) that ἰδόντι will not do ; in view of many passages I could refer to this last caution is not uncalled for.

iii 262. δειλὴ ἐγώ, οἷον πόθον Ἑλλάδος ἔκποθεν ἄτης
λευγαλέης Φρίξοιο ἐφημοσύνῃσιν ἔλεσθε.

If λευγαλέης is right I should prefer to take it with Ἑλλάδος. But I suspect that it should be λευγαλέῃς ; cf. 374. ἄτης λευγαλέης however is found at ii 438.

When ἔκποθεν is thus used by Ap. and Quintus the genitive depending on it is not qualified. Q. somewhere says ἔκποθεν Ἰδαίων ὀρέων, but there Ἰδαίων ὀρέων is only an expansion of Ἴδης and is therefore quite different ; he would not say, I think, ἔκποθεν Ἴδης πολυπίδακος. On Ap. ii 224 see Mr Mooney's note. At iii 1289 ἀφράστοιο does not agree with κευθμῶνος ; cf. ii 824.

iii 276. τετρηχώς.

Mr Mooney must be right in explaining this to mean "tumultuous." τέτρηχα is never transitive, and if it could be τετρηχὼς would have to mean "having already caused perturbation," which would be premature and untrue. The troubled state of his victims is transferred to Eros himself. But does Mr Mooney seriously believe that the *Anacreontea* are older than Apollonius ?

iii 281. βαιὸς ἑλυσθεὶς of course means "crouching into a small space." So at 655, πέσεν εἰλιχθεῖσα means "she threw herself all in a heap."

iii 294. ἄγχι μάλ' ἐγρομένη· τὸ δ' ἀθέσφατον ἐξ ὀλίγοιο
δαλοῦ ἀνεγρόμενον σὺν κάρφεα πάντ' ἀμαθύνει.

A woman blows up a smouldering fire. Both ἐγρομένη and ἀνεγρόμενον can hardly be right, but the former seems unimpeachable or at least incorrigible. Hemsterhuys indeed proposed ἄγχι μάλ' ἐζομένη, but that is ridiculous. ἀνεγρόμενον is in no way suspicious in itself, and the reading of one MS. ἀνερθόμενον is probably only a corruption of this; Brunck however on the strength of it proposed ἀνερχόμενον, perhaps to shew his contempt for his poet. What a poet *might* have said is ἀναιθόμενον. This is answered by αἴθετο in the next line, as so often with similes. But if we are to regard ἀνερθόμενον as important, what it points to is perhaps περθόμενον (or -ου). For δαλοῦ περθομένου actually occurs in Phrynichus trag. 6, πυρὶ περθόμενοι in Pindar *Pyth.* iii. 50. It is just such an odd use as Ap. likes.

ii 298. Ἄρπυιαί τ' (δ' ?) Ἶρίς τε διέτμαγον.

iii 1147. μετὰ δ' αὖτε διέτμαγον.

διέτμαγεν Spitzner. Wrongly, for it displays a melancholy want of historical perspective to restore forms which are philologically correct without stopping to enquire what forms Ap. knew in his Homer. Now in Homer the MSS. always vary between the two forms; Aristarchus preferred διέτμαγεν, but it is clear that it was a disputed point. We have no evidence that Ap. would have agreed with Aristarchus about it; we know that he disagreed with him on other questions, such as the use of ἑός, our MSS. of Ap. are united in reading διέτμαγον, and therefore we have no right whatever to alter them.

So too we have no business to be meddling with ἀνερείψατο and the like; they were in Homer, and the editors of Quintus allow them to stand in him.

iii 380. ὥς κεν ἐρητύοισθε καὶ ὕστερον ὁρμηθῆναι,
οἷα δὲ καὶ μακάρεσσιν ἐπεψεύσασθε θεοῖσιν.

"Such things have you attributed even to the blessed gods," translates Mr Mooney, but quotes no parallel to οἷα δὲ in this sense. It is also possible to take the line as an exclamation, but that is hardly pleasing or natural. I am inclined

to think that the construction is *ὁρμηθῆναι, οἷα δὲ ἐπεψεύσασθε ἐπιψεύσασθαι.*

iii 386. *Αἰήτη, σχέο μοι τῷδε στόλῳ.*

So MSS. but *τῷδε στόλῳ* seems unintelligible and the scholiast apparently read *τοῦδε στόλου*. A genitive is wanted, and the meaning ought to be "abstain from this accusation." *τοῦδε ψόγου?* This suits the context on both sides, but *στόλου* and *στόλῳ* have nothing to do with either.

iii 404. *ἤν κ' ἐθέλῃσθα.*

This reading ought to be kept. The question is not whether *ἤν κε* is possible in the eyes of a modern philologist, but whether it was possible for Apollonius, and it shews again a miserable want of historical imagination to treat him as if he was a genuine antique. Now *ἤν κε was* possible for him, because he knew it in his text of Homer, which had not been doctored then by philologists. At Δ 353 *ἤν κ' ἐθέλῃσθα* is the reading of A, much the most important MS., and of Brit. Mus. pap. 136. and probably of Aristarchus whose readings A so often preserves. At I 359 it is the reading of L and Plato *Hipp. Min.* 370 B. Mr Zimmermann (*Neue kritische Beiträge zu den Posthomerica des Quintus Smyrnaeus*, p. 17) adds σ 318 *ἤν περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλωσιν*; he reasonably doubts the correctness of this *for Homer*, but can anybody doubt that it was what Ap. and Quintus read in *their* Homer? And in Quintus himself we have *ἤν κ' ἐθέλῃσθα* at vii 215, which I defended by comparison of Δ 353 in this Journal, no. 62, p. 293, and to which Zimmermann now adds xii 226 *ἤν κε...ἐκπέρσωμεν*. By what supernatural coincidence is it that we find exactly this phrase *ἤν κ' ἐθέλῃσθα* in our texts in Homer, Apollonius and Quintus, if it is corrupt in all three of them? I do not defend it as original in Homer, but if it is not right in the other two good-night to Pascal and the calculus of probability and common sense.

iii 475. *Αἰσονίδη, μῆτιν μὲν ὀνόσσεαι ἥντιν' ἐνίψω;*

Punctuate thus, I think, as a question. It is true that *πείρῃς δὲ* begins the next line, and that at first sight *μὲν* and *δὲ* seem to answer each other. But it is a little odd to say:

"you will indeed blame the counsel I give, but it is not right to give up trying to escape from evil." Why should Jason blame his counsel? As a matter of fact he jumps at it. Put as a question it seems more natural, and *μὲν* can be used with questions, as by Eur. *Hipp.* 316, and even in prose, as by Plato *Charm.* 153 C.

iii 498. *δώσειν δ' ἐξ ὄφιος γενύων σπόρον ὅς ῥ' ἀνίῃσιν γηγενέας.*

ἀνίῃσιν L, *ἀνίησιν* vulg. The subjunctive looks to me very strange in this construction; Ap. does not use it by itself as a future, I think. *ὅς κ' ἀνίῃσιν* would make it right, at least on Homeric principles, and *ῥα* does not seem to mean much. But perhaps it is most likely after all that *ἀνίησιν* is the original.

iii 548. *δοκέω δέ μιν οὐκ ἀθερίζειν.*

The old reading *ἀθερίξειν* is right, I believe. Is there any instance of a "prophetic present" in oratio obliqua? *ζ* and *ξ* are the same thing in MSS.

iii 551. *πότμον ὑπεξήλυξε.*

μόρον G, *οἶτον* ed. Flor. Where did *οἶτον* come from? It looks right, and can hardly be an emendation, for it is most improbable that Lascaris had *μόρον* in his MS. or MSS.

iii 632. *τὴν δ' ὕπνος ἅμα κλαγγῇ μεθέηκεν.*

I have always thought that this phrase must have been in Tennyson's mind when he wrote in *The last tournament*:

> "Then, out of Tristram waking, the red dream
> Fled with a shout."

But in Ap. *ἅμα κλαγγῇ* fits the context properly.

iii 637. *δείδια μὴ μέγα δή τι φέρει κακὸν ἥδε κέλευθος.*

There seems no good reason for adopting *φέρῃ* from a couple of second-rate MSS. The subjunctive is the only really valid Homeric construction, but Ap. did not know this, and at any rate the subjunctive is not a whit better here.

iii 672. *κέκλιτ' ἀκηχεμένη ὀρύψεν δ' ἑκάτερθε παρειάς.*

There is no sense in the aorist, read *ὀρύπτεν*. The corruption is very common; see e.g. the app. cr. to Ξ 114, Ω 20, 110. Even if we translate "had scratched" here, it will not do, for

it is absurd to suppose she only took one scratch and had done with it.

iii 699. *ἀλλ' ὅμοσον Γαῖάν τε καὶ Οὐρανὸν ὅττι τοι εἴπω*
σχήσειν ἐν θυμῷ σύν τε δρήστειρα πέλεσθαι.

πέλεσθαι is aorist in sense; see Ebeling. We can indeed take it to be for an imperative, but the other sense is obviously to be preferred, "swear that you will help." Besides, Medea does swear that she will help in 717. To get this sense we must have an aorist infinitive, which Ap. uses freely instead of the future after verbs of swearing and the like. He is particularly fond of mixing up futures and aorists as at 768, *δωσέμεν—καταφθίσθαι—θανέειν—ὀτλησέμεν*. Possibly we should even accent *πελέσθαι*?

Quintus uses *πέλε* as a gnomic aorist at x 66.

iii. 741. *τὴν δέ μιν αὖτις.*

Mr Samuelsson defends this monster, and even on the strength of it propounds another of the same kind at iv 1410. Scholars naturally hesitate at it, but their attempts at correction appear to me feeble, and what Brunck meant by *τὴν δὲ μὲν* I cannot conceive. (Pauw proposed the same outrage at Quintus iv 568.) Read *τήν γε μὲν αὖτις* (*αὖθις* MSS., corr. Brunck).

MSS. vary between *δὲ* and *γε* at i 15, ii 151, iv 1023. At iv 49 Headlam restores *τήν γε* for *τήνδε*. At i 356 most MSS. have *ὥστε*, depraved further to *ὅς γε* in two; Brunck must be right there in restoring *ὥς δέ*, of which Ap. is extraordinarily fond; he uses it at least sixteen times, even in apodosis to *ὡς* at ii 1183, iii 551, 760, where I think we should put a full stop at end of 755.

Again MSS. vary between *μὲν* and *μιν* at ii 8, iv 880, 1489, 1718. At iv 4 Merkel restores *ἦ ἔμεν* for *ἦ ἐμιν* or *ἠέ μιν*, but he is wrong in reading *θέλγε μιν* for *θελγέμεν* at iv 436. At iv 1508 two MSS. have *μιν*, the rest *κεν*; Wellauer's *μὲν* is wrong, for Ap. never says *ἀλλὰ μέν*, and Merkel seems right with *ἀλλ' ᾧ κεν*.

iii 782. *ἦ μιν ἄνευθ' ἑτάρων προσπτύξομαι οἷον ἰδοῦσα;*

It hardly seems possible to construe *ἰδοῦσα* satisfactorily. "To see him and embrace him" may do in English, because

"to see" can mean "to have an interview." But *ἰδεῖν* does not mean that, at any rate in Apollonius. Nor does "having set eyes on him" suit well. Probably it is an instance of the common confusion between *ἰὼν* and *ἰδών*. "Shall I *go* and embrace him?" is what is wanted.

iii 901. *ἤματι τῷ.*

"To-day," but *ἤματι τῷ* never means that. Read *τῷδ'*, and see ii 797, iii 538.

iii 1083. *εἰ δέ τοι ἡμετέρην ἐξίδμεναι εὔαδε πάτρην,*
ἐξερέω· μάλα γάρ με καὶ αὐτὸν θυμὸς ἀνώγει.
ἔστι τις αἰπεινοῖσι περίδρομος οὔρεσι γαῖα.

1084 contains the only real violation of Wernicke's law in Ap. To make it worse it is combined with a spondaic word in the fourth foot, which is very rare in him. The whole line is weak and superfluous, and I should hope that it was interpolated by some one who did not see that *εἰ...εὔαδε...ἔστι τις* was a blameless sentence in itself.

iii 1092. *ἵν' οὐδέ περ οὔνομ' ἀκοῦσαι*
Αἰαίης νήσου.

"We must assume," says Mr Mooney, "either an ellipse of *ἔστι* or—" no matter what. Cf. iii 680, *ἵνα μηδέ περ οὔνομα Κόλχων*, iv 262, *γένος ἦεν ἀκοῦσαι*, which shew clearly that his first idea is right. Shall I confess that I once upon a time put *ἄκουσα* in my margin?

Quintus has a still stronger ellipse of *ἔστι* with *ἀκοῦσαι* at xii 311, *τρὶς τόσον Ἑρμοῦ ἄπωθεν ὅσον βοόωντος ἀκοῦσαι.*

iii 1235. *τῷ δὲ καὶ ὠκυπόδων ἵππων εὐπηγέα δίφρον*
ἔσχε πέλας Φαέθων ἐπιβήμεναι· ἂν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
βήσατο, ῥυτῆρας δὲ χεροῖν ἔχεν.

Brunck, knowing the difference between an imperfect and an aorist, proposed *ἕλεν* for *ἔχεν*. His successors ignore it. The three lines mean: "And Phaethon *brought* the chariot round for him to mount, and he mounted himself also, and *took* the reins." But is *αὐτὸς* Phaethon or Aeetes? It is not clear, because *ἔσχε πέλας* does not shew whether Phaethon was already in the chariot, but *ἔσχε* probably means "drove,"

like Homer's *ἔχεν ἵππους*, and we may suppose then that he was. If so, *αὐτὸς* is Aeetes. In any case "he was holding the reins" is nonsense.

iii 1276. *τοὺς μὲν Καυκασίοισιν ἐφεσταότας σκοπέλοισιν,*
τὸν δ' αὐτοῦ παρὰ χεῖλος ἑλισσόμενον ποταμοῖο.

Any reader must pause and wonder at *ἑλισσόμενον*. To translate "winding bank" is out of the question, I think; to regard it as a hypallage is just possible; but on looking closer one sees that *ἐφεσταότας* ought to have a participle to answer it, and reflects that as Aeetes was in a chariot—in fact *ἑλισσόμενον* agrees with *τόν*. The Colchians stood along the Caucasian crags; Aeetes was wheeling about in the plain by the river. This is a touch suiting well his violent and restless character.

Perhaps I had better explain why I think "winding bank" will not do. *ἑλίσσεσθαι* is used of things twisting about in motion, and it can also be used of a line drawn round anything and now at rest, as at iii 138. But I doubt very much whether it can be used of a line at rest which is simply not straight but curving.

iii 1311. *εὐρὺ δ' ἀποπροβαλὼν χαμάδις σάκος, ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα*
τῇ καὶ τῇ βεβαὼς ἄμφω ἔχε πεπτηῶτας.

Coleridge, Mooney, Seaton, with one voice declare that Jason strode from side to side, moving now here now there. When a man is holding down a pair of ferocious bulls, why should he be gyrating himself thus? This all comes again of neglecting tenses. *βεβαὼς* never means anything but "standing," the punctuation is *ἔνθα, τῇ καὶ τῇ βεβαώς*, and the meaning is: "he held them down on right and left, standing with feet planted wide on right and left."

So again at iv 359, *ποῦ βεβάασιν; "ποῦ = ποῖ"* says Mr Mooney. No such thing, *βεβάασιν = εἰσίν*.

Perhaps he will retort upon me with Quintus x 458, *ἵκετο δ' ἐμβεβαυῖα δι' οὔρεος*. But on second thoughts he will see that *ἐμβεβαυῖα* is there untranslatable, and only a corruption of *ἐμμεμαυῖα*. The opposite corruption got into some ancient copies of Homer Ω 81.

iii 1372. The scholiast says that this and the following verses are taken from Eumelus, and goes on to quote Sophocles. The quotations shew that the scholion is misplaced; it should be on 1354, where it proves *φρίξεν* to be right against Mr Samuelsson, if proof were wanted.

iii 1373. *οἱ δ' ὥστε θοοὶ κύνες ἀμφιθορόντες*
ἀλλήλους βρυχηδὸν ἐδήιον· οἱ δ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν
μητέρα πῖπτον ἑοῖς ὑπὸ δούρασιν.

The construction is *οἱ δ'...<οἱ μὲν> βρυχηδὸν ἐδήιον, οἱ δὲ κτλ.* Else why the second *οἱ δέ*? And the meaning is again missed by the commentators: "some of them bit one another like dogs." I will not say that *βρυχηδὸν* never could mean "shouting," but the other is evidently far better and suits the poet's own use of *βρυχὴ* elsewhere.

iii 1383. *ἡμίσεας ἀνέχοντας ἐς ἠέρα· τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἄχρις*
ὤμων τελλομένους· τοὺς δὲ νέον ἑστηῶτας.

It is evident that *ὤμων* is wrong; it is no use to quote Valerius vii 619, for that only shews that the corruption is very old, not that it is not a corruption. Add Val. i 222:

Tollunt se galeae sulcisque ex omnibus hastae,
Et iam iamque humeri.

κώλων Merkel, which is wrong, because "appearing as far as the legs" is not different enough from "appearing with half the body." *κνημῶν* is also obvious, but Struve's *γούνων* is better because it marks a definite stage in the body.

Apart from other considerations the *καὶ* in 1383 is conclusive against *ὤμων*. I cannot understand how Mr Mooney can pretend that it is also superfluous in 1385, or how he can have the boldness to quote the scholiast on i 604 with his own note on i 602 staring him in the face.

iv 23. *πτερόεις δέ οἱ ἐν φρεσὶ θυμὸς*
ἰάνθη· μετὰ δ' ἧγε παλίσσυτος ἀθρόα κόλπων
φάρμακα πάντ' ἄμυδις κατεχεύατο φωριαμοῖο.

Preston appears to be in the right when he takes this to mean that Medea poured all her *φάρμακα* out of their box into her bosom; but he seems to be alone in this opinion. Others

suppose that Medea had taken poisons out to kill herself, and now changing her mind puts them back in the box. To see that this will never do it is only necessary to look at the Greek. *ἀθρόα, πάντ' ἄμυδις*, what do these words mean? Why should Medea take out *all* her *φάρμακα*, good and bad alike, if she wanted to commit suicide? One was enough. And why bundle them all back in the box in confusion? And if she poured them *out of* her bosom, they must have got first into it; when and how and why? But she had made up her mind to fly; of course she would take her *φάρμακα* with her, as everybody knows she did to Creon and Creusa's cost. It is reasonable that she should take them out of the *φωριαμός*, because that would have been heavier to carry and the way it is talked of in iii 802—817 rather suggests that it was a good size. And she flies in such a hurry that she does not even put on her shoes (iv 43), nor can she carry a box because both hands are occupied (44—46). Therefore she did not take the *φωριαμός*, but she did take the *φάρμακα*, and she cannot have taken them except in her *κόλπος*. Therefore Preston is right.

But the double genitive, *κόλπων* and *φωριαμοῖο*, is awkward. I suspect that Ap. wrote *κόλπῳ*; he is fond of this Homeric use of the dative. Cf. iii 155, *βάλε κόλπῳ*; 542, *ἔμπεσε κόλποις* (*κόλπῳ* G and so superscribed in L, and therefore probably right). It is not uncommon to find *ν* wrongly added at the end of a hexameter; some Homeric instances are given in *Journ. Phil.* no. 37, p. 27. In Ap. we have five examples besides this line. i 465, *ἀτύζει* L, *ἀτίζει* G, *ἀτύζειν* al.; i 734, *ἀυτμῇ* Brunck with one MS., *ἀυτμὴν* al.; iii 413, *ἀκτῇ* LG, *ἀκτήν* al.; iii 531, *ἀυτμὴ* LG, *ἀυτμὴν* al.; iii 1238, *ἀέθλων* LG wrongly for *ἀέθλῳ*, where Mr Samuelsson, knowing nothing of this habit of MSS., proposes a more violent and quite unnecessary change. Six times therefore is *ν* added wrongly at the end of the line, but it is only lost once, ii 86, *μετώπῳ* MSS., *μετώπων* Wellauer. But in the other parts of the line I note only the following additions of *ν*: ii 829, *αἰγανέην* MSS., *αἰγανέῃ* Merkel; iii 239 *ἄλλων* LG for *ἄλλῳ*. And see my note on i 902. For loss of *ν* not at the end see ii 1019 where *ἀμφαδίην* is corrupted

to *ἀμφαδίῃ* in L. No doubt if we had a complete collation of all the MSS. we should find more of all these corruptions. Our MSS. also vary between *τὴν* and *τῇ* at iii 248, iv 257. The corruption of ii 238 is due to another cause.

The scholiast, I believe, is wrong in saying that *πτεροεὶς* is predicative. Tryphiodorus 373, *πτερόεντος ἀναΐξασα νόοιο*, "flighty," and Tryph. knew his Ap. I take it that *ἰάνθη* means "was melted" as at ii 739, iii 1021, iv 1096. "Her fluttering spirit was melted within her."

iv 35. *οἵη δ' ἀφνειοῖο διειλυσθεῖσα δόμοιο*
ληιάς, ἥν τε νέον πάτρης ἀπενόσφισεν αἶσα,
οὐδέ νύ πω μογεροῖο πεπείρηται καμάτοιο,
ἀλλ' ἔτ' ἀηθέσσουσα δύης καὶ δούλια ἔργα
εἶσιν ἀτυζομένη χαλεπὰς ὑπὸ χεῖρας ἀνάσσης·
τοίη ἄρ' ἱμερόεσσα δόμων ἐξέσσυτο κούρη.

This simile is hard to understand. The Scholiast says that Medea fled as a slave runs away from a cruel mistress. Schellert (apud Mooney) says that *διειλυσθεῖσα* means *abducta*, and that the point of the comparison lies merely in the unhappy state of mind of the captive. Certainly at first sight the scholiast's account seems the better; the simile is more complete. But a close scrutiny of the language proves Schellert to be in the right. (1) The slave has *not yet* done any work; this is natural on Schellert's view, most unnatural on the other. (2) *ὑπὸ χεῖρας* must go with *εἶσιν* and must mean *coming into the power of a mistress*, not running away from it. We cannot translate: "fearing slavery under the hands of a mistress," for, though Ap. often enough strains *ὑπὸ* with an accusative, yet nothing like this can be quoted from him.

The simile is not very appropriate, but it is enough that there should be the one point of resemblance in the miserable state of mind. To object that the other details do not correspond to the flight of Medea is simply to betray ignorance of the use of the simile in epic poetry.

iv 90. *μηδ' ἔνθεν ἑκαστέρω ὁρμηθεῖσαν*
χήτει κηδεμόνων ὀνοτὴν καὶ ἀεικέα θείης.

The optative seems to me a little out of tune; *θείῃς*?

Ap. uses *θείω* of course, not *θήω*. Cf. Mr Seaton's restoration of *ἐκδώῃς* at 1015. At 1087 again *θείῃς* is better.

iv 131. *ἔκλυον οἳ καὶ πολλὸν ἑκὰς Τιτηνίδος Αἴης*
Κολχίδα γῆν ἐνέμοντο παρὰ προχοῇσι Λύκοιο,
ὅς τ' ἀποκιδνάμενος ποταμοῦ κελάδοντος Ἀράξεω
Φάσιδι συμφέρεται ἱερὸν ῥόον· οἱ δὲ συνάμφω
Καυκασίην ἅλαδ' εἰς ἓν ἐλαυνόμενοι προχέουσιν.

The geography is again extraordinary, and the Scholiast's suggestions make it worse than it is. The river Lycus flows out of the Araxes into the Phasis. Doubtless one river can send an arm into another as the Euphrates does into the Tigris, but that arm could not be decently described as a third river with a different name from the other two. However let it be called the Lycus. Where then does it go to? The Araxes is of course the river which flows into the Caspian, eastwards; the Phasis flows into the Euxine, westwards. How then in the name of hydrostatics can an arm of the Araxes join the Phasis and flow into the Euxine? Yet this is what Ap. seems to make it do, and Mr Mooney at any rate acquiesces, saying that the Caucasian sea is the Euxine if I understand him aright[1]. The Scholiast says it is the Caspian, and so it must be, I think. But then arises at once the objection that the Phasis does not enter the Caspian.

Let us consider the context. The serpent who guards the golden fleece is hissing; the noise is so great that it is heard far away from Aea. Now Aea is close to the mouth of the Phasis, and the serpent was close to it also. How then could Ap. say that the hissing was heard far off from Aea at the mouth of the Lycus, Lycus and Phasis having one and the same mouth? It is as if one said that an explosion at Liverpool was heard far off from Liverpool at the mouth of the Mersey! The conclusion seems to be that the mouth of the joint Lycus and Phasis is not at Aea at all, but somewhere very far off, and if the Caucasian sea is the Caspian it suits the conclusion very well.

Then the Phasis is not the same Phasis as that which flows

[1] So also says Walther *de Ap. Rh. rebus geograph.*

into the Euxine at Aea? It seems that it is and it is not; Mr Mooney's note supplies the missing link: "according to Hecataeus the Caspian was connected with the Euxine by the Phasis." Ap. must have had this in his mind, and so makes the same river flow into Euxine at one end and Caspian at the other! He might have admitted that this was improbable had he been questioned about it, and perhaps he had never tried to get any clear idea into his head; his rivers behave in a strange manner all over Europe, and why should he be particular about legendary Oriental streams? He likes to talk about geographical names, as other poets do, and if it sounds fine enough, does not conceive that he is bound to pedantic accuracy.

It still remains however a very mysterious thing that he should say *οἳ Κολχίδα γῆν ἐνέμοντο ἑκὰς Αἴης*. Aea suggests the country of the Colchians rather than the city, and by adding the epithet *Τιτηνίδος* Ap. practically compels us to take it as the country. For the Titen is a river from which the country is named, and wherever it was it cannot have been at the *city* of Aea, whose river is Phasis. If then the text is right, Ap. seems to say: "those who dwelt in Colchis far away from Colchis." To escape this absurdity we must either insist on Aea being the city, which we have just seen to be almost if not quite impossible, or must suppose *Κολχίδα* to be a corruption, which appears to me to involve the smaller improbability of the two. Even if we took *ἑκὰς Αἴης* to mean "far away *in* Aea," we should be no better off.

Colchis is just the last country in the world which a poet would mention here; he is seeking a gigantic hyperbole and must go outside Colchis, so he would mention the remotest place in that particular direction he could think of; by limiting it to the Colchian country he would spoil his effect. So Virgil to indicate the borders of the world speaks of *Caspia regna*, *Aen.* vi 798, possibly with some reminiscence of this very passage. It is not inconceivable that *Κασπίδα* stood in his text; the Caspians lived at the point in question, about the Araxes. It must be added however that the form *γῆν* is very suspicious. Ap. has it only twice elsewhere, ii 352, 748, in

each case at the beginning of a line, whereas *γαῖα* is on every page.

iv 164. *φαρμάκῳ ἔψηχεν θηρὸς κάρη, εἰσόκε δή μιν*
αὐτὸς ἐὴν ἐπὶ νῆα παλιντροπάασθαι Ἰήσων
ἤνωγεν, λεῖπεν δὲ πολύσκιον ἄλσος Ἄρηος.

Medea went on shampooing the serpent, till Jason bade her return, and—*she* left the grove? Surely not; of course Jason went back with her. Exactly similar is 750:

ὄφρα μιν ἥρως
χειρὸς ἐπισχόμενος μεγάρων ἐξῆγε θύραζε
δείματι παλλομένην· λεῖπον δ' ἀπὸ δώματα Κίρκης.

λεῖπον was easily infected by *ἤνωγεν*. At 336 MSS. vary between *λίπεν* and *λίπον*, where one is intrinsically no better than the other and probably both are wrong.

It may be said that *λεῖπον* cannot be right because the poet goes on to say next that Jason *μέγα κῶας ἐναείρατο χερσίν*, and therefore that Jason cannot leave the grove in 166. But Jason has already taken the fleece from the tree in 162; so, whatever *ἐναείρατο* means in 171, it does not shew that he stopped behind. Besides it is evident that he would not dispense with Medea until he was ready to go with her.

iv 176. *τόσσον ἔην πάντῃ χρύσεον ἐφύπερθεν ἄωτον.*
βεβρίθει λήνεσσιν ἐπηρεφές.

Any one knowing the ways of Greek epic sees at once that there is something wrong. The asyndeton here is horrible and impossible. To write *ἐὸν* for *ἔην* is obvious, it is quite wrong, though the editors who ignore it do not know why it is wrong, and it was proposed by—Madvig! But the difference between the Greek and the Latin Madvig is one of the most remarkable things in the history of scholarship. Had this been a Latin author, Madvig would have considered the context, he would have asked himself why *κῶας* in 171 and *ἄωτον* in 176, why *πάντῃ* and *ἐφύπερθεν*, he would have drawn the obvious conclusion and written as Apollonius did:

τόσσον ἔην πάντῃ· χρύσεον δ' ἐφύπερθεν ἄωτον
βεβρίθει.

The κῶας is the whole skin, wool and all, the ἄωτον is the woolly fleece upon the skin, as it is in Homer. The ἄωτον does not grow all over the κῶας, hence the distinction between πάντῃ and ἐφύπερθε.

iv 202. νόστῳ ἐπαμύνετε. νῦν δ' ἐνὶ χερσὶν
παῖδας ἑοὺς πάτρην τε φίλην γεραρούς τε τοκῆας
ἴσχομεν.

This spirited appeal is utterly ruined by the addition of δὲ after νῦν. In sentences of this sort a Greek poet never adds δὲ any more than we should add "and" in English. Cf. e.g. that glorious line O 719, νῦν ἡμῖν πάντων Ζεὺς ἄξιον ἦμαρ ἔδωκεν, and see Headlam's note on *Agamemnon* 1476, where a similar, though not identical, usage demands a similar correction.

iv 289. μετ' Ἰονίην ἅλα βάλλει.

All are agreed that Ἰονίην is wrong, and Gerhard's ἠῴην is generally accepted. But it is a strange corruption; ἠοίην makes it easier to understand. ἠοῖος is the Homeric form, at any rate outside the *Hymns*, and would be the Apollonian form too. It should be restored here at any rate, and perhaps everywhere else in Ap.

iv 313. τῇδε would be better than τῇ δέ.

iv 325. ᾧ πέρι δὴ σχίζων Ἴστρος ῥόον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα
βάλλει ἁλός.

Is this supposed to mean that Ister "pours forth a sea-flood"? But that is nonsense. Or "hits the flow of the sea"? But that is worse still; βάλλει of a river can only mean "pour." Or "pours towards the sea"? But how can the genitive ἁλός mean that? Nor can it depend anyhow upon ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα. In fact ἁλὸς is impossible; read ἅλις, a word Ap. uses very freely; the passage likest to this is iii 67, ἅλις πλήθοντος Ἀναύρου. Another objection to ἁλὸς is ἅλαδε in the next line. P.S. I now find ἅλις actually standing in the text of Merkel's *editio minor*.

iv 378. πῶς ἴξομαι ὄμματα πατρός;
ἦ μάλ' ἐυκλειής;

Delete the mark of interrogation after *ἐυκλειής*, for nobody would dream of saying: "How shall I go back to my father? Shall I be very fair of fame?" Of course she would say: "How shall I go back to my father? Truly it would be with a pretty reputation!" Such irony is constantly used in such cases, e.g. *Odyssey* xiv 402, *οὕτω γάρ κέν μοι ἐυκλείη...εἴη*, which may well have been in Ap.'s mind, *Ajax* 1006, *ποῖ γὰρ μολεῖν μοι δυνατόν;...ἢ πού με Τελάμων...δέξαιτ' ἂν εὐπρόσωπος.*

iv 475. *ὀξὺ δὲ πανδαμάτωρ λοξῷ ἴδεν οἷον ἔρεξαν*
ὄμματι νηλειὴς ὀλοφώιον ἔργον Ἐρινύς.

Cf. Pind. *Olymp.* ii 41, *ἰδοῖσα δ' ὀξεῖ' Ἐρινύς.* It looks as if Ap. took *ἰδοῖσα ὀξεῖα* there to mean "looking with sharp sight."

iv 654. *Στοιχάδας αὖτε λιπόντες ἐς Λἰθαλίην ἐπέρησαν*
νῆσον, ἵνα ψηφῖσιν ἀπωμόρξαντο καμόντες
ἱδρῶ ἅλις· χροιῇ δὲ κατ' αἰγιαλοῖο κέχυνται
εἴκελαι· ἐν δὲ σόλοι καὶ τεύχεα θέσκελα κείνων.

Mr Mooney quotes Strabo and "Aristotle"; add Lycophro 874:

κρόκαι δὲ Μινυῶν εὐλιπῆ στελγίσματα
τηροῦσιν, ἅλμης οὐδὲ φοιβάζει κλύδων,
οὐδ' ὀμβρία σμήχουσα δηναιὸν νιφάς.

And schol. ad loc. *ὅθεν καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν δίκην ἐλαίου ἐν ταῖς ψήφοις φέρονται ῥανίδες.* What was seen on the stones then were oily marks or stains, and so too "Aristotle" in Mr Mooney's note says that the pebbles "got their colour" from the *στλεγγίσματα*. I cannot make sense of *χροιῇ κέχυνται εἴκελαι*. Mr Mooney truly says that *χροιῇ* must mean "colour," but "pebbles like colour" means nothing, and "like *in* colour" is not sufficient. Then too *κέχυνται* seems a little strange, there is no subject in the text to go with it, and *εἴκελαι* has nothing properly expressed to agree with. Read *χροιαί*, "similar stains are still smeared upon the beach," just like *φέρονται ῥανίδες*. This disposes of all three (or four) objections at a blow.

For *τεύχεα* L man. sec. and L 16 have *τρύχεα*. This is on the face of it the more genuine. I do not pretend to under-

stand what either word exactly means here, but provisionally should restore *τρύχεα*. I see too that Mr Coleridge reads *τρύχεα*.

iv 665. *αἵματί οἱ θάλαμοί τε καὶ ἕρκεα πάντα δόμοιο*
μύρεσθαι δόκεον.

What are these *ἕρκεα*? Certainly we should not expect the court-yard or the walls round it to appear to run with blood, and yet *ἕρκεα* can hardly mean anything else. It is not easy to distinguish clearly between *ἕρκος* and *ἑρκίον*, but my feeling is that *ἑρκίον* is the right word for the wall of the room, which I take to be meant. *αἵματι δ' ἐρράδαται τοῖχοι* says Homer, *υ* 354. *ἑρκία* would be pretty sure to be corrupted into *ἕρκεα*.

iv 668. *τὴν δ' αὐτὴ φονίῳ σβέσεν αἵματι πορφύρουσαν.*

Circe dreams that her palace walls run with blood, and fire consumes her *φάρμακα*; that fire she quenches with *φόνιον αἷμα*. One would suppose that the blood is the same in both cases. If so *φόνιον* means nothing much, and I do not see why it should. Homer talks strangely of *φόνον αἵματος* at Π 162. I doubt if Ap. means more than "bloody gore," and that is strong enough, I hope. Cf. Theocr. xxii 98.

πορφύρουσαν is unintelligible. Do not compare *πορφυρέαις ἑλίκεσσιν* at i 438, because there it is *λιγνὺς* which is spoken of, and that means smoke, nor yet "ignis purpureus," because "purpureus" means "bright," *πορφύρεος* "dark." But Merkel's *παμφανόωσαν* is rather licentious; *μορμύρουσαν* is possible.

iv 678. *οὔπω διψαλέῳ μάλ' ὑπ' ἠέρι πιληθεῖσα,*
οὐδέ πω ἀζαλέοιο βολαῖς τόσον ἠελίοιο
ἰκμάδας αἰνυμένη.

The primeval slime produced monsters when not yet squeezed dry by the surrounding air, "nor receiving moisture from the sun." So say the commentators, ignoring the epithet *ἀζαλέοιο* and the context. The point is that the earth was *not yet dried*, and Ap. could not say in the same breath "and not yet being wetted." Shaw alone, it seems, give the sense with "humoribus orbata."

Ap. is speaking of the philosophy of Empedocles. Well, Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἱδρῶτα τῆς γῆς ἐκκαιομένης (-ον?) ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου διὰ τὴν ἐπιπόλαιον πίλησιν. Plut. *plac. phil.* iii 16. There is the origin of Ap.'s πιληθεῖσα too. Ovid *Met.* i 418, "postquam vetus humor ab igne | percaluit solis." There can be no shadow of doubt that Shaw is right, but how to get the sense out of the Greek is more than I know. αἴνυμαι is never passive, nor is it ἀπαίνυμαι. The plural of ἰκμὰς is very strange; I can only find one instance of it and that in Aristotle. The obvious thing to think of is ἰκμάδ' ἀμειρομένη, considering the variant reading in Homer ρ 322; Hesychius glosses ἀμείρεσθαι by στερεῖσθαι. Perhaps ἀμεργομένη is better, for ἀμέργω properly means to squeeze out moisture from olives, whence ἀμόργη. The verb is used at i 882 of bees getting nectar out of flowers. ἀμέργει· ἀποστερεῖ says Hesychius again. ἀμερδομένη comes to the same thing. But ἕλκω is the verb to be expected of attraction of this sort; look then at ii 1257, ἦπαρ ἀνελκομένοιο Προμηθέος, "having his liver pulled up." Did Ap. say here ἰκμάδ' ἀνελκομένη?

All I feel sure of is that Shaw is right and the text corrupt. ὑπ' ἠέρι means *by* the air, as Mr Mooney translates it, not *under* the air. Ap. uses ὑπὸ with the dative continually in this manner.

iv 704. ἀτρέπτοιο φόνοιο.

"The deed of blood which can never be undone" Mooney. "Murder still unexpiated" Seaton. "Unatoned bloodshed" Coleridge. None of these translations is satisfactory; ἄτρεπτος ought to mean "immoveable" or "unturned"; it is not ἀναποτρέπτοιο. Remembering how Orestes is partially cleansed of blood by being προστετριμμένος against things in Aesch. *Eum.* 229, I incline to ἀτρίπτοιο.

iv 786. οἵη τέ σφ' ἐσάωσα διὰ πλαγκτὰς περόωντας
πέτρας, ἔνθα πυρὸς δειναὶ βρομέουσι θύελλαι,
κύματά τε σκληρῇσι περιβλύει σπιλάδεσσιν.
νῦν δὲ παρὰ Σκύλλης σκόπελον μέγαν ἠδὲ Χάρυβδιν
δεινὸν ἐρευγομένην δέχεται ὁδός.

οἵῃ L, οἵως al. Both are correct, but οἵῃ is more exquisite in itself besides being in much the best MS. and should be kept.

Commentators have seen that there is some difficulty in this passage, but have only nibbled at it. They think that it refers to the passage of the Symplegades and they remark that πυρὸς is therefore wrong, and they also observe that Hera, who speaks in this place, takes credit to herself for saving the Argo there whereas it was Athena who really did so. But the difficulties are very great indeed and cannot be palliated.

First πλαγκτὰς cannot mean the Symplegades at all. Ap. is very careful about distinguishing the two; never does he confuse them. Secondly Hera here says that it was she who sent the Argo through the Planctae, and so she did as we know from Homer, μ 72, Ἥρη παρέπεμψεν ἐπεὶ φίλος ἦεν Ἰησών. It is passing strange that Ap. should agree with Homer in saying so here and yet should all the time be thinking of something altogether different, and should contradict himself about the Symplegades because he has forgotten that it was Athena who was there at work; he is not given to self-contradiction. Thirdly πυρὸς is right in reference to the Planctae and wrong in reference to the Symplegades; Merkel's πάρος is utterly pointless; it is another extraordinary thing therefore that the text of Ap. should again agree with Homer about the Planctae and yet he should all the time be thinking of the Symplegades. Fourthly, if we read πάρος, and if we suppose the Symplegades to be meant, just see what a miserable description it is of them! "Where dreadful storms always rage and the waves lash the reefs," and not one word about the real danger. It is as if you said that you saved a man out lion-hunting where he might have run his foot through with a porcupine's quill. Fifthly the last two lines are simply untrue; the Argonauts are not going to return by Scylla and Charybdis at all; they are going to avoid them altogether. Look at δέχεται ὁδός, and consider whether this can fairly be taken to mean anything except that they are to pass that way.

There is no getting out of it; Hera in this passage says that she saved them through the Planctae, not through anything else, and that they are now to go through the strait of

Scylla. But this brings us up all standing against the great difficulty which has upset all the commentators. As the poem now stands, the Argonauts have not yet passed the Planctae and therefore Hera could not have said this, and they are not going to pass by Scylla and Charybdis either, though indeed the commentators have never noticed that point.

We cannot cut out the lines; the first three might go without much loss but they are quite in the style of Apollonius and do not look like an interpolation, and there would still remain the last two. No, there is only one solution that I can see, but it is rather startling. In our poem the Argonauts have not yet passed the Planctae and are not going to pass Scylla; Hera appeals to Thetis to help them through the Planctae instead. But in the first edition Hera helped them through the Planctae by herself, as Homer says, and *then* appealed to Thetis to save them on their way through the strait of Scylla and Charybdis, which in that edition they *did* pass. We may well suppose that critics drew mortifying comparisons between the accounts of Homer and Apollonius; or we need only suppose that Ap. thought better of it for himself and decided to alter his plot; anyhow alter it he did, and made Hera appeal to Thetis *before* the Planctae, cutting out Scylla and Charybdis altogether.

But altering your plot is a dangerous game to play; it is difficult to get rid of the lines first drawn on the canvas, and the end of it was that Ap. by an inadvertence which I fully admit is very extraordinary left this unlucky bit in the speech of Hera. Such accidents will happen in such cases. An artist whose shoe-latchet Apollonius was not worthy to unloose has committed a very similar crime in *Antigone*, and nobody found it out till Mr Drachmann only the other day[1].

If this conclusion is correct, and I cannot see how to escape from it, it entirely overthrows the notion that the alterations in the second edition were small and unimportant. But that notion never had much foundation to rest upon. It is not

[1] *Hermes*, vol. 43, p. 67, vol. 44, p. 628. So too Shakespeare left the phrase "my old lord of the castle" in his *Henry IV*, Pt 1, Act 1, Sc. ii, though after Oldcastle had become Falstaff it was senseless.

likely that the poet would be working on his epic all those years without finding anything to improve except odd lines and phrases.

I owe to Mr Samuelsson, quoted by Mr Mooney *ad loc.*, the information that Valerius talks of *flamma* and *fumus* at the Symplegades; the less said about Mr Samuelsson's inference from this the better, but it does suggest that Valerius was misled by the passage in the same way as the moderns have been.

It may as well be added that in the *Orphic Argonautica* the Argo does go through the strait of Scylla, and is helped through it by Thetis. Is the author there following the first edition of Ap., or some other early version of the story, or inventing out of his own head?

iv 796. *ἀλλ' ἐμέ τ' αἰδομένη καὶ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ δειμαίνουσα.*

Surely there is no difficulty about the hyperbaton of *τε*; why then omit it, when it is in the best MSS., and introduce a hiatus which cannot, I believe, be paralleled in our poet?

iv 1047. *οὐδ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ*
αἰδεῖσθε ξενίης μ' ἐπὶ γούνατα χεῖρας ἀνάσσης
δερκόμενοι τείνουσαν ἀμήχανον; ἀλλά κε πᾶσιν,
κῶας ἑλεῖν μεμαῶτες, ἐμίξατε δούρατα Κόλχοις
αὐτῷ τ' Αἰήτῃ ὑπερήνορι, νῦν δ' ἐλάθεσθε
ἠνορέης, ὅτε μοῦνοι ἀποτμηγέντες ἔασιν;

Punctuate thus, with marks of interrogation. To take these impassioned appeals as mere statements of fact washes out all the colour. I think the clause *ἀλλά κε—ὑπερήνορι* is part of the question; in an orator it would be *ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν πᾶσιν ἂν ἐμάχεσθε, νῦν δὲ τούτους μόνους φοβεῖσθε;*

At 1063 again punctuate:

ἐννυχίη, τῇ δ' ἀμφὶ κινύρεται ὀρφανὰ τέκνα, χηροσύνῃ πόσιος.

iv 1115. *ᾗσιν ἐπιφροσύνῃσιν.*

Said of Arete, queen of the Phaeacians. *ᾗσί τ' ἐπιφροσύνῃσι* is probably the right reading in Homer *η* 74, a conjecture by Voss for various nonsense in our MSS. This passage is greatly in favour of Voss, as Ap. is applying the Homeric phrase to the same person. But here too is an ancient variant *ἐφημοσύνῃσιν.*

For *ἦσιν ἐπιφροσύνῃσιν* compare also Homer *Epigr.* xvii, Manetho vi 470, and the *Orphic Argonautica* says that Alcinous ruled the Phaeacians *ἐπιφροσύνῃσι* (1296).

iv 1269. *πλημμυρὶς ἐκ πόντοιο μεταχρονίην ἐκόμισσεν.*

I feel sure that *μεταχρονίην* is right here as in four other places in Ap., meaning "high and dry." This use, so common in late poets, is probably due to nothing but a very ancient corruption in Hesiod *Theog.* 269. So too the Apollonian use of *γεραρὸς* for *γεραιὸς* comes of early corruption of *γεραιὸς* with the second syllable short; perhaps Aesch. *Agam.* 723 was the fruitful parent of this shapeless brood.

iv 1312. *ἔνδιον ἦμαρ ἔην περὶ δ' ὀξύτατοι θέρον αὐγαί.*

ὀξύτατοι LG, *ὀξύταται* vulgo. Kühner-Blass (vol. i, p. 544) gives several instances of comparative and superlative adjectives with only two terminations. To them add Pindar frag. 266, *γλυκερώτερος ὀμφά*, Theocritus xvii 90, *νᾶες ἄριστοι*. Again at Coluthus 147:

εἴ με διακρίνων προφερέστερον ἔρνος ὀπάσσῃς,

Hera is speaking to Paris and *προφερέστερον* agrees with *με*, but Abel not understanding this invokes a lacuna.

We should accordingly add this line to the list and keep the reading of LG.

Aristotle *Hist. An.* 538^{a} 30 says *μακροβιώτεροι τῶν ἰχθύων αἱ θήλεις* according to Bekker's text. But *αἱ* is there only a misprint for *οἱ*.

iv 1322. *οἰοπόλοι δ' εἰμὲν χθόνιαι θεαὶ αὐδήεσσαι.*

The scholia give two explanations of *χθόνιαι*, first that it means they are "native" as being daughters of Libya, secondly that they are *γηγενεῖς*. Upon the whole I think that Ap. means "earth-goddesses," which is much the same as *γηγενεῖς*, contrasted with Dryads, sea-nymphs and the like. If we take it to mean "of the land" we anticipate *Λιβύης τιμήοροι* in the next line.

The scholia then say *αὐδήεσσαι δὲ αἱ εἰς λόγον ἀνθρώποις ἐρχόμεναι*. I should like to know where they got this; it is not one of the regular explanations of *αὐδήεσσα*, the meaning

of which was hotly disputed among the ancients. It is plain that *αὐδήεσσα* can neither mean "speaking with mortal voice" nor "speaking to mortals" because there is no taint of mortality about it. It might mean "vocal" and if any known goddess were dumb there might be some point in Homer's calling Circe and Calypso "vocal." But any one who will consider seriously the way in which he uses this epithet can hardly doubt, in spite of all difficulties in the way, that he intended by it something like "dwelling upon earth." It may be like other Homeric adjectives a tradition, corrupt or not, from poetry far more ancient, but how Homer uses it is clear to any unprejudiced eye. (ζ 125 however is very obscure.)

The question for us here is how did Apollonius use it? Surely he shews here that in his opinion it means "dwelling on earth." His work is partly a commentary on doubtful Homeric points (see Merkel, *Prolegomena*, lib. ii, cap. iv). Now suppose that you want to shew what idea you attach to the word "scrannel"; if you think it means—what I suppose it really does, you say, or at least Browning does,

"The scrannel pipe that screams in heights of head."

Certainly if the meaning were notoriously disputed we should take care not to put scrannel in that connexion, supposing we ourselves held that it meant something totally different. Ap. was a man of like passions with ourselves. If he uses *αὐδήεσσαι* alongside of *χθόνιαι*, he tells you, as plain as a man endowed with mortal speech can tell, that he holds with those critics who think there is some connexion of idea between the two words.

"Vocal" is merely idiotic nonsense in this passage, and even if "mortal" be imported out of the clouds, idiotic nonsense it remains. These goddesses have rolled out four whole hexameters already, and then forsooth they impart the information that they speak like mortals. Go to a Frenchman, recite him four Alexandrines, and then add:

Et moi, je suis un homme, ami, parlant français,

and you may be thankful that the French are a polite nation.

iv 1392. *ὡς φέρον, ὡς εἰσβάντες ἀπὸ στιβαρῶν θέσαν ὤμων.*

Read of course *ὡς φέρον, ὥς*. This formula occurs frequently in Ap., and, whatever Theocritus and others may do with the double *ὡς*, Ap. regularly uses it in the Homeric way and with the Homeric accentuation. If the theory of some philologists about such phrases were correct, they ought to explain how it is that in Homer we can always treat the second *ὡς* as *οὕτως*, and why it is only in late poets that we get *ὅσον ὅσον, ὡς ὡς* and the like. It seems more natural to suppose that the double *ὡς* got first used incorrectly and then by analogy people went on to the double *ὅσον* etc., just as they took to saying *ὁτὲ μὲν* for *τοτὲ μὲν* and other things of the kind.

iv 1487. *ὅ σ' ἐὼν μήλων πέρι, τόφρ' ἑτάροισιν*
δευομένοις κομίσειας, ἀλεξόμενος κατέπεφνεν.

τόφρα is supposed to mean *while*, which it never does, and *κομίσειας thou wouldst carry off*, which is impossible. Two such solecisms together are a little too much. *τόφρα κομίσειας* can only mean one thing naturally, *in order that thou mightst carry off*. So I think it does; *ἀλεξόμενός σε περὶ μήλων* means *σὲ μαχόμενον περὶ μήλων* and *τόφρα* depends upon this implied *μαχόμενον* by a constructio ad sensum. Bad enough then! But ellipses, or whatever they are to be called, of this sort are found in Ap.

iv 1519. *αὐτὰρ ὁ μέσσην*
κερκίδα καὶ μυῶνα, πέριξ ὀδύνῃσιν ἑλιχθείς,
σάρκα δακὼν ἐχάραξεν.

Such is the punctuation of all the editions I have looked at. When one does not know what a sentence means, prudence would suggest economy in stops, and I defy any one to construe this sensibly. Mopsus has trodden on a serpent; the serpent, innocent of commas, "twisted himself in pain round the tibia and calf" of Mopsus and bit him on the leg.

iv 1562. *πρόφρων δ' ὑποέσχεθε βώλακι χεῖρας.*

ὑπερέσχεθε MSS., corr. Mooney. But *χεῖρας*? Euphemus would never want to hold out *both* hands for the clod; Pindar is content with one. Read *χεῖρα*, comparing ii 87, *φυσιόωντε* LG, *φυσιόωντες* Pariss.; iii 206, *κατειλεύσαντε βοείαις*,

κατειλύσαντες G; iii 410, φυσιόωντε Paris. unus, probably rightly, φυσιόωντες cett.

iv 1647. σύριγξ αἱματόεσσα κατὰ σφυρόν· αὐτὰρ ὁ τήνγε
λεπτὸς ὑμὴν ζωῆς ἔχε πείρατα καὶ θανάτοιο.

The σῦριγξ (not σύριγξ) is the blood-vessel in the ankle of Talos. αὐτὰρ ὁ τῆσγε Brunck, which Mr Mooney justly complains is not epic. Mr Mooney's own ὅ τ' ἦγχε is not likely to satisfy anyone else; cp. also i 293, 1161, 1216, ii 480, 620, iii 432, 1293, iv 1344, all of which end up with αὐτὰρ ὁ τήνγε or τόνγε or the like, so that it is very unsafe to meddle with αὐτὰρ ὁ. I should like to propose αὐτὰρ ὁ τῆγε, supposing another instance of wrong addition of ν. And the article then is the common Homeric article introducing a new subject with the noun added later in apposition, just as Ἡρακλέης is added at i 1161.

iv 1675. Read χαλέπτει, ὡς.

There were the makings of a fine poet about Apollonius, if only he had not tried his hand at epic. I do not so much mean his Dresden-china Medea, who is neither one thing nor another, who plays the pathetic and sentimental in one book and murders her brother in the next without knowing that there is anything remarkable about it. And the rest of his characters are the most uninteresting set of waxworks one can wish to see. But in many passages he shews a really remarkable technical power. To take one instance, the storm in the second book almost rivals Virgil's. Look at, or rather listen to, the wind stirring the tree-tops (ii 1100):

αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἠμάτιος μὲν ἐν οὔρεσι φύλλ' ἐτίνασσεν,
τυτθὸν ἐπ' ἀκροτάτοισιν ἀήσυρος ἀκρεμόνεσσιν,

with all those light or dull-sounding vowels, and the wonderful arrangement of consonants, twice culminating in -ασσεν and -εσσιν, and then the sudden change, as it were into the flat sub-mediant:

νυκτὶ δ' ἔβη πόντονδε πελώριος, ὦρσε δὲ κῦμα
κεκληγὼς πνοιῇσι,

where the reiterated ον in πόντον thunders with an effect as

wonderful as Milton's "shatter" in the opening of *Lycidas*. And presently at 1115 he seems to burst the sky into rain:

> *αὐτίκα | δ' ἐρράγη | ὄμβρος ἀθέσφατος, ὗε δὲ πόντον*
> *καὶ νῆσον καὶ πᾶσαν ὅσην κατεναντία νήσου.*

The last syllable of *ἐρράγη* shortened like that in that position is not so easy to parallel from him, and is in its way superb, while the second line with its *ν* and *σ* is dripping all over and makes one shake oneself. But what do the public care about these things? asked Tennyson. What indeed!

ARTHUR PLATT.

P.S. On further consideration I think that *ἀρίζηλοι* is right in ii 250 in the sense of *terrible*. Ap. several times uses a disputed Homeric word in different senses at different places, just to shew perhaps that he knows of both theories about it. So he makes *ἀρίζηλος* mean *manifest* in iii 598, *terrible* in ii 250.

ΑΙΟΣ AND ΕΙΟΣ IN LATIN POETRY[1].

When I was young I was curious to know the principles, if any there were, upon which the Greeks, in forming adjectives from substantives by means of the suffixes *-αιος* and *-ειος*, made their choice between the two. What started this curiosity was not so much the practice of the Greeks themselves as the apparently indiscriminate employment of the terminations *-aeus* and *-ēus* in those adjectives derived from Greek proper names which I encountered in Latin texts and especially, where they are oftenest found, in texts of the Latin poets[2]. If *Pallene* made *Pallenaeus*, why did *Cyllene* make *Cylleneus*? If *Pythagoras* made *Pythagoreus*, why did *Cinyras* make *Cinyraeus*? If Ovid wrote *Ephyraeus*, why did Propertius write *Ephyreus*? If Lucan wrote *Lageus* in four places, why did he write *Lagaeus* in a fifth? I carried my trouble, as young men will, to the grammars in use around me; and they received me, as they still receive inquisitive youth, with silence broken by suggestio falsi. That Latin grammarians should regard Greek adjectives as beyond their province, and should dismiss them with a bare mention or

[1] The full and descriptive title of this paper is too unwieldy, for it is 'The forms assumed in current texts of the Latin poets by Greek adjectives in *-αιος* and *-ειος* derived from proper names'; and even this requires a note to say that the choice between *-eus* and *-ius* as representatives of *-ειος* is not here in question.

[2] In reading Latin prose I have paid no constant attention to matters of this sort, and the only correction which I have noted is at Liu. XXXIV 38 5 'parte una a *Phoebeo*, altera a *Dictynneo*.' The names of these two temples were *Φοιβαῖον* and *Δικτυναῖον* or *Δικτύναιον*. At Cic. de fin. II 94 the editors now rightly follow the best MSS in giving *clamore Philocteteo*, but the error *Philoctetaeus* survives in the lexicons of Georges and of Lewis and Short.

even ignore them altogether[1], is nothing strange; but when Geheimrat Dr Iwan von Mueller employs Prof. Dr Karl Brugmann to write a 'Griechische Grammatik' for a 'Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Geschichte und Methodik der einzelnen Disziplinen,' one might hope to learn something upon this head. One learns nothing, nor from the 'Griechische Grammatik' of Gustav Meyer, nor from the 'Comparative Greek Grammar' of Joseph Wright, nor from the 'Handbuch d. griech. Laut- und Formenlehre' of H. Hirt. But not all the oracles are dumb: there is one shrine at which a voice or hideous hum runs through the arched roof in words deceiving: Kuehner-Blass I ii p. 292 'the ending *-αιος* is found outside its proper sphere, namely the adjectives from words of the 1st declension'; p. 294 'very rare is *-ειος* from substantives of the 1st declension.' If *-ειος* from substantives of the 1st declension is very rare, why does one meet it so very often? why is it so easy to find Ὀρέστειος, Θυέστειος, Αἰήτειος, Μιθριδάτειος, Πυλάδειος, Εὐριπίδειος, Θουκυδίδειος, Σιμωνίδειος, Ἀντιγενίδειος, Δημάδειος, Παρμενίδειος, Ἐπιμενίδειος, Ἀπέλλειος, Γοργίειος, Κλεινίειος, Νικίειος, Μινύειος, Πυθαγόρειος, Πρωταγόρειος, Ἀναξαγόρειος, Διαγόρειος, Ἑρμαγόρειος, Βρασίδειος? And if adjectives from words of the 1st declension are the proper sphere of the ending *-αιος*, why can Mr K. Zacher in his elaborate treatise 'de nominibus Graecis in *-αιος -αια -αιον*' produce from all Attic and common

[1] Kuehner-Holzweissig 1912 vol. I p. 981 'Gentilia...*-aeus* = *-αιος* (von Namen auf *-a*).. (Coreyra) *Coreyr-aeus*, (Smyrna) *Smyrn-aeus*, (Cyrene) *Cyren-aeus*': is Cyrene a name in *-a*? p. 997 'Abgeleitete Adjektive...*-ius* und *-īus* = *-ειος* in griechischen Wörtern, als *Thucydid-ius*, *Sophocl-ēus*, *Democrit-ēus* und *-īus*, *Aristotel-ius*, *Epicur-ēus* und *-īus*, *Pythagor-ēus* usw.' No room for *Argēus* or *Argeus* among gentilia nor for *Dionaeus* in either class. A less defective rule was given by Priscian G. L. K. II p. 70 'haec autem *ae* diphthongum habent paenultimam quae a femininis in *e* longam apud Graecos desinentibus...deriuantur..., ut *Crete Cretaeus*, *Hyle Hylaeus*, *Dione Dionaeus*' and by Seruius Aen. I 697 'sciendum sane omnia Graeca nomina in *η* exeuntia, cum deriuationem faciunt, *η* in *ae* diphthongon conuertere, ut *αἰλή* (*αἴλη* wrongly Thilo) *aulaea*, Ἴδη *Idaea*, *Αἴτνη Aetnaea*.'

Mr Roby knows of the terminations *-icus* (vol. I p. 281) and *-iacus* (p. 283) and *-enus* (p. 309), but not of *-aeus* nor *-ēus* nor *-ius*.

Greek no more than five examples (pp. 134 sq., *βορραῖος*, *ἱκταῖος*, *Γυγαῖος*, *Ἑρμαῖος*, *Λυκορμαῖος*) of adjectives in *-αιος* from words of the 1st declension in *-ας* or *-ης*? why must he go to an Aeolic poem for *Νικιά(ι)ας ἀλόχω*, and to a Thessalian inscription for *Ἀμυνταῖος* or *Παυσανιαῖος* or *Ἡρακλειδαῖος*?

Beside the grammars I naturally looked through the works of Lobeck, and my hopes rose when I found on pp. 541—59 of his Phrynichus a chapter 'de adiectiuis in *-αιος*.' Alas, its true subject was a very different matter, adjectives in *-ιαιος* and *-ιμαιος*. Scattered about his writings there were a few observations more relevant to my enquiry; but Lobeck, like the ancient grammarians themselves, was usually more occupied with the accentuation of these adjectives than with their form. I was therefore left to puzzle out a system for myself; and I framed a general rule, which I did not mistake for a discovery of my own, because it seemed to me that some scholars, Bergk and Meineke for instance, were already in possession of it, though it now and then escaped their memory.

Adjectives in *-αιος* are formed from feminine substantives of the 1st declension. Adjectives in *-ειος* are formed from substantives of the 2nd and 3rd declensions and from masculine substantives of the 1st. *ἀγελαῖος*, *ἀγοραῖος*, *ἀρουραῖος*, *ἀελλαῖος*; but *ἀνθρώπειος*, *ἀνδρεῖος*, *δεσπότειος*.

Both rules have exceptions, which, so far as they are known to me, I will now collect into classes. I have not read through Greek literature for this purpose, nor indeed for any other; but a large though by no means complete assemblage of adjectives in *-αιος* has been made by Mr K. Zacher in his treatise 'de nominibus Graecis in *-αιος -αια -αιον*,' diss. philol. Halens. vol. III. To the anomalous forms which his list contains I have made but few additions, though I might have made many from late authors such as Nonnus and especially from Stephanus Byzantius[1]. Subtraction rather was needed, and I have ignored late words like *ἀστραῖος* and *πηλαῖος*.

[1] e.g. *Ἄδωνις Ἀδωναῖος*, *Ἀθύρας Ἀθυραῖος*, *Ἄπρος Ἀπραῖος*, *Ἄπτερα Ἀπτεραῖος*.

The class of regular formations in *-αιος* comprises *προτεραῖος ὑστεραῖος ποσταῖος πολλοσταῖος δευτεραῖος τριταῖος* etc., from *ἡ προτέρα* (*ἡμέρα*) etc.; and hence by false analogy arises *σκοταῖος*, which at first, as in Xenophon, is used only in the same adverbial way as the adjectives on which it is modelled. Another false analogy, it would seem, creates these forms from feminines not of the 1st but of the 2nd declension: *ληναῖος, νησαῖος, ὁδαῖος, χερσαῖος, ἐρημαῖος*. Next after these come quite anomalous formations from nouns of the 2nd declension which are not feminine: *ἀμολγαῖος, ἀμορβαῖος, ἀντραῖος, δεπαστραῖος, κηπαῖος, λακκαῖος, νωταῖος, ὑπωμαῖος*, to which might be added *Κυδναῖος* (epigr. Gr. Kaib. 1078 6, of Roman date), *Νειλαῖος* (*ὡς Ἀπολλώνιός φησιν* Steph. Byz. s.u. *Νεῖλος*, anth. Pal. VI 321 2 Leon. Alex.) and others of even less authority[1]. An equally anomalous and still smaller class is derived from masculine nouns of the 1st declension[2]: from two circumflexed words, *βορρᾶς βορραῖος, Ἑρμῆς Ἑρμαῖος*; *ἱκέτης ἱκταῖος* (*ἱκταίου* – ∪ – Aesch. supp. 385); *Ανκόρμας Ανκορμαῖος* (Lycophr. 1012); *Γύγης Γυγαῖος*[3]; *Γενήτης* (Strab.) *Γενηταῖος* (Apoll. Rhod.). Then there is a separate group, whose termination etymologers say was originally *-ασιος*, derived from neuters of the 3rd declension in *-ας*: *γεραιὸς, γηραιὸς, κνεφαῖος, λεπαῖος, οὐδαῖος*; and with these it is natural to class those which are formed, perhaps by false analogy, from other neuters of that declension, *κραταιὸς, λεχαῖος, σκνιφαῖος*. Adjectives derived, like *ἠρεμαῖος*, from adverbs, or, like *ἰσαῖος*, from other adjectives, lie beyond our concern; and so do those which are evidently (as *ἱμαῖος* and *λοχαῖος*) or probably (as *λογαῖος* and *δρομαῖος*) derived from verbs.

Adjectives in *-ειος* formed from feminine substantives of

[1] It is not clear that *χορταῖος* comes from *χόρτος*, with which it has no evident connexion in meaning; there is no good reason to believe that *Βουναία Ἥρα* is derived either from *βουνός* or from *Βοῦνος*; *μεδιμναῖος* Hesych. is probably a false reading for *μεδιμνιαῖος*, and *ἀροτραῖος* anth. Pal. VII 209 4 for *ἀρουραῖος*.

[2] In Thessalian this formation is normal, *Αἰνιαδαῖος, Πολιταῖος, Μαρσυαῖος* etc., Zacher p. 135.

[3] But *Γυγαίη Λίμνη* may be no more derived from *Γύγης* than *Ἐρυθραῖος* from *Ἐρύθρας* or *Αἰγαῖος* from *Αἰγεύς*.

the 1st declension are also to be found, some of them in a list on pp. 33 sq. of the treatise of G. F. Aly 'de nominibus *ιο* suffixi ope formatis'[1]: *αὐλὴ αὔλειος, κλίνη κλίνειος, μοῦσα μούσειος* (beside *μοισαῖος*), *νύμφη νυμφεῖος* (differing in sense from *νυμφαῖος*), *ἔγγειος* (etc., beside *ἔγγαιος* etc.). To these I add *χύτρα χύτρειος* (beside *χυτραῖος*), *Θεμίσκυρα Θεμισκύρειος*, *Βερενίκη Βερενίκειος*, *Ἑκάλη Ἑκάλειος*, hesitate to add *Πραξίλλειος* (which first appears in Hephaestion and papyr. Oxyrh. II p. 46 2), and refrain from adding a good deal else[2].

After all allowance for oversight in collecting or misjudgment in examining these exceptions, it will be seen that adjectives in *-ειος* from feminine substantives of the 1st declension, and adjectives in *-αιος* from any other substantives, are very rare in Greek, and that compared with the vast number of words obedient to the rule their total is insignificant. But in current Latin texts, though also rare, they are less rare; and I contend in this paper that they are much too common.

To decide how any one of these forms should be spelt in Latin, the simplest way is to look and see how it is spelt in Greek. But this, though simple, is very often impossible, because in Greek the form is nowhere to be found. There is no extant Greek literature in which adjectives from proper

[1] Here too subtraction is necessary: *ἀγχόνειος* is only a false reading for *ἀγχόνιος*, and *ὄμπνειος* for *ὄμπνιος*; *ἀράχνειος* (beside *ἀραχναῖος*) shall be considered when its turn comes; *ἀρχεῖος* is not in the lexicons, but only the substantive *ἀρχεῖον*, which is another matter; *Πράμνειος* is derived by some from *Πράμνη* but by others from *Πράμνος*; *κυανοπρῴρειος* is not from *πρῷρα* but *κατὰ πλεονασμόν* from *κυανόπρῳρος*, like *φατειός* from *φατός*, unless indeed it ought to be *κυανοπρώειρος*; *σπονδεῖος* and *χήρειος* are not early formations, and may have been affected by the substantives *σπονδεῖον* and *χηρεία*.

[2] Such as *μελίσσειος, χελώνειος*, *Βούρειος, Ἑλένειος*, all lacking good authority. *Σέρρειος* is not from *Σέρρα* but from *Σερρεῖον*; *Ἀριάδνειος Ἐφύρειος Χιμαίρειος* shall be dealt with hereafter. What they print in Arcad. p. 45 1 (= Herodian Lentz vol. I p. 136 18 and II 230 28) *τὰ εἰς* $\overline{\text{ειος}}$ *ὑπερτρισύλλαβα μὴ πλεοναζούσης τῆς* $\overline{\text{ει}}$ *διφθόγγου προπαροξύνεται· Αἰάντειος Ὁμήρειος γαλήνειος Ἱππάρχειος* is not an anomalous adjective of *γαλήνη*, but *Γαλήνειος* regularly formed from *Γαληνός*. (I notice a similar mistake in Lentz II 424 4, where *Λῆνος* should be either *Ληνός* or *Λῆνος*: see Steph. Byz. s. u.)

names are so numerous as in Latin poetry, and many of them survive in Latin poetry alone. The plain road being thus blocked, we must find another; and the inexperienced will perhaps imagine that they can learn the true spelling from the Latin MSS.

But there is no help to be had from that quarter. When it is a question between *e* and *ae*, not even the best and oldest of Latin MSS are competent witnesses; and this may be proved without more ado from the MSS of Virgil. Virgil is more carefully edited than anyone else, and his current text in this particular is pure of error; but here are the blunders of his principal MSS. buc. VI 56 *Dictaeae*] *-eae* Mγ. 72 *Grynei*] *-aei* MP. IX 30 *Cyrneas*] *-aeas* Pb. 47 *Dionaei*] *-ei* MPγbc. georg. I 240 *Riphaeas*] *-eas* AMPRbc. II 448 *Ituraeos*] *-eos* Mc. III 12 *Idumaeas*] *-eas* FPcM¹γ¹. 89 *Amyclaei*] *-ei* P. 382 *Riphaeo*] *-eo* Rγbc. Aen. III 19 *Dionaeae*] *-eae* FMPγac. 117 *Cretaeis*] *-eis* FPγacM¹. 466 *Dodonaeos*] *-eos* P. VI 749 *Lethaeum*] *-eum* R. VII 10 *Circaeae*] *-eae* MPRγb. 799 *Circaeum*] *-eum* M. X 179 *Alpheae*] *-aeae* Rc. XI 404 *Larisaeus*] *-eus* M. XII 412 *Cretaea*] *-ea* Rc. The false forms have often more authority than the true; and it follows that when an adjective is not extant in Greek its true form cannot be settled by the spelling of Latin MSS.

It is the less necessary to labour this point, because the editors whom I criticise do not in fact adhere to the MS spelling. Not only do they defy it where they know it to be wrong, but they abandon it where they do not know it to be right. Moreover it is not in all Latin poets that details of orthography have been recorded by those who have collated their MSS. We know how these adjectives are spelt in the chief MSS of Virgil, Horace, Catullus, Propertius, and some other authors or parts of authors; but there are others whose critical apparatuses are silent upon such points, and silent they may well remain.

For it is to analogy alone that in most cases we must look for guidance, and Latin copying must be corrected by Greek rule. I will therefore now review those passages of classical poetry where modern editors, or any considerable

portion of them, present these adjectives in a false or doubtful form. I do not expect to meet with much opposition, and perhaps I am treating the whole affair too seriously and forcing an open door; for what brings such barbarisms into print and keeps them there is not for the most part any false opinion or deliberate intent, but chance and inadvertency and unthinking acquiescence in tradition. Even among the editors of Propertius, who are the worst offenders, it is rare to come upon a note like Hertzberg's at III 3 52, '*Philetaeus* ueram attributi formam esse, non, quod adhuc in Burmanni editione habetur, *Phileteus*, nunc nemo nescit.' The Latin lexicons, though often wrong, are wrong less often than the editions; but the most trustworthy book of reference I know is Quicherat's thesaurus poeticus, which seldom makes mistakes in this department and has evidently grasped the rules.

Ἀκρισιώνη.

Verg. Aen. VII 410 quam dicitur urbem | *Acrisioneis* Danae fundasse colonis.

'ab Acrisione, id est Danae' Prisc. G.L.K. II p. 68 11[1].

-eis codd. and edd., *-aeis* Heinsius.

Ouid. met. V 239 *Acrisioneas* Proetus possederat arces.

-eis codd. (ex sil.) and edd.

Sil. I 661 permutare coacti | *Acrisioneis* Tirynthia culmina muris.

-eis codd. (ex sil.) and edd.

Colum. X 205 *Acrisioneos* ueteres imitatur amores.

-eos or *-ios* codd., *-eos* edd., *-aeos* Wernsdorf.

No Greek example is cited by Stephanus or Pape, but the thes. ling. Lat. improvises Ἀκρισιώνειος.

In the first three passages the adjective refers not to Danae herself but to Argos or its king Acrisius; and as Ἰασίων existed beside Ἴασιος and Ἰκαρίων beside Ἰκάριος, so Ἀκρίσιος may have had a by-form Ἀκρισίων, from which Ἀκρισιώνειος would be no less legitimately derived than Διώνειος from Δίων. But in Columella the word can only

[1] The note of Seruius 'patronymicon est' (i.e. Ἀκρισιωνηίς) may be neglected.

mean *Danaeios*; it is therefore derived from Ἀκρισιώνη and its form should be Acrisionaeos, like Διωναῖος from Διώνη. When Virgil's MSS give *Dionei* at buc. IX 47 and *Dioneae* at Aen. III 19, they are disregarded; and what are Columella's MSS in comparison with Virgil's?

Ἀγανίππη.

Prop. II 3 20 par *Aganippeae* ludere docta lyrae.

-eae codd. and edd.

Claud. XXIX 8 fons *Aganippea* Permessius educat unda.

-ea codd. and edd., *-aea* Heinsius.

No Greek example is cited, but the thes. ling. Lat. is ready with Ἀγανίππειος, formed, I suppose, from ἵππειος by prefixing ἄγαν. The editors, if they thought about the question at all, have probably been misled by the false analogy of Φιλίππειος, Μενίππειος, Ἀριστίππειος etc. The true form is Aganippaeus, no matter what may be found in Propertius' MSS, none of them older than the 12th century, or in the MSS of the laus Serenae, none of them older than the 11th.

Ἀράχνη.

Manil. IV 136 seque in *Arachneo* magnam putat esse triumpho.

-eo codd. and edd.[1]

anth. Lat. Ries. 742 47 Serica *Arachneo* densentur pectine texta.

-eo codd. and edd., including Birt in Claudian (p. 406).

The thes. ling. Lat. has rightly Arachnaeus, but is still inventive in the field of Greek and gives the original as Ἀράχναιος proparoxytone.

Here analogy is reinforced by authority, anth. Pal. VI 39 3 (Archias) *ἀραχναίοιο μίτου*, 206 6 (Antip. Sid.) *ἀραχναίοις νήμασιν*: the Ἀραχναῖον αἶπος of Aesch. Ag. 321 is less certainly relevant. Suidas has *ἀράχνειον νῆμα*, but that appears to be only a false or corrupt citation of anth. Pal.

[1] Bentley reads 'Arachnea magnum portasse triumphum,' in which *Arachnea* is a substantive.

VI 206 6 above, for he continues καὶ ἀραχναῖος μίτος and quotes VI 39 3.

Ἀριάδνη.

Catull. 66 60 ex *Ariadneis* aurea temporibus.

-eis codd. and edd., *-aeis* Passeratius.

Ouid. fast. v 346 ex *Ariadnaeo* sidere nosse potes.

-aeo Heinsius, Merkel 1841, Riese, Peter, Guethling, *-eo* Merkel 1889 and Davies: of the MSS there is no clear report.

Germ. phaen. 71 clara *Ariadnaeo* sacratast igne corona.

-eo codd., *-aeo* edd.

Manil. v 21 atque *Ariadneae* caelestia dona coronae.

-eae codd. and edd.

Manil. v 253 clara *Ariadneae* quondam monumenta coronae.

-eae codd. and edd.

Auien. Arat. 199 haec *Ariadnaei* capitis testatur honorem.

-aei edd., the MSS vary.

Auien. Arat. 247 usque *Ariadnaeae* sese uicina coronae | lubricus inclinat.

-aeae edd., the MSS vary.

Ariadneus thes. ling. Lat., and so anth. Pal. v 222 2 (Agathias) τῶν Ἀριαδνείων ζῆλον ἔχοι λεχέων. Analogy however requires Ἀριαδναῖος, Ariadnaeus, and one example of Ἀριάδνειος in a poem of the 6th century after Christ is poor authority to the contrary. The substantive Ἀριάδνεια (ἑορτή τις) in the certamen Hom. et Hes. has no bearing on the form of the adjective, for Ἑκάτειον exists beside Ἑκαταῖος and πομπεῖον beside πομπαῖος.

Ἀταλάντη.

Manil. v 179 atque *Atalanteos* conatum ferre labores.

-eos codd. (some *Atlanteos*, and so Bentley) and edd.

Stat. Theb. IV 309 iamque *Atalantaeas* implerat nuntius aures.

-aeas edd., the MSS vary and P is absent.

Stat. Theb. VII 267 qui breue litus Hyles *Atalantaeam*que superbi | Schoenon habent.

-eam P, *-em* most codd., *-aeam* or *-aeum* most edd., but

-eam Kohlmann Wilkins and Garrod, in spite of their *-aeas* at IV 309.

The thes. ling. Lat. registers *Atalanteus* and coins Ἀταλάντειος, but the form should be Atalantaeus as in Georges, though it is not worth much that Ἀταλανταῖος occurs in Stephanus Byzantius as the name for inhabitants of the island Ἀταλάντη.

Βερενίκη.

Catull. 66 8 e *Beroniceo* uertice caesariem.

-eo codd. and edd.

Bereniceus thes. ling. Lat.

The spelling of the MSS matters nothing, for they use *e* to represent not only the diphthong, as in *Larisaeus Oetaeus Hymenaeus*, but even the two syllables *ae* in *Protesilaeam* 68 74; and I have already signified under Ἀριάδνη that the temple-name τὸ Βερενίκειον in Ath. V p. 202 D will not help to settle the question. *Berenice* should by analogy make *Berenicaeus*; but the anomalous form has the authority of a Greek writer older than Catullus (though it is true that his best MS is only of the 13th century): Theocr. XV 110 *ἁ* Βερενικεία *θυγάτηρ*. And the form will cease to be anomalous if we derive it not from Βερενίκη but from a paragogic Βερενίκεια. This is attested in Steph. Byz. s. u. Ἀγάθη, not indeed for the queen, but for the cities which bore her name: Ἀγάθεια *τῆς* Ἀγάθης *παραγωγή, ὡς* Βερενίκεια *καὶ* Θεσσαλονίκεια. If Βερενίκη was also called Βερενίκεια, as Πηνελόπη was also called Πηνελόπεια, there could be formed from this substantive an adjective of the same length, Βερενίκειος, as the *Meliboeus* of Lucretius and Virgil is formed from Μελίβοια.

Χίμαιρα.

Culic. 14 Arna *Chimaereo* Xanthi perfusa liquore.

-eo codd. and edd.

Claud. CI 76 (anth. Lat. Ries. 494[b]) ipsa *Chimaeraea* cretum de gente nouerca.

-aea codd. and edd.

The thes. ling. Lat. gives *Chimaereus*, but nevertheless quotes the verse from the laus Herculis with Chimaeraea; and that is the analogical form. It is of no importance that the *ἐπιμερισμοί* of the false Herodian ed. Boissonade p. 149 have *Χιμαίρειον θράσος· τὸ τῆς Χιμαίρας.*

Κινύρας.

Luc. VIII 716 quaestor ab Idalio *Cinyraeae* litore Cypri.
-eae most codd., *-aeae* edd.
Stat. silu. v 1 214 Coryciaeque comae *Cinyrea*que germina.
-ea cod. and edd.

No Greek example is cited (for the town *Κινύρεια* or *Κινύρειον* will not settle the question), but the thes. ling. Lat., to make everyone happy, provides *Κινύρειος* for Statius' editors and *Κινυραῖος* for Lucan's.

Latin MSS and Greek analogy are here by accident in accord: the form is Cinyreus, like *Ἀναξαγόρειος, Διαγόρειος, Ἑρμαγόρειος, Πρωταγόρειος, Πυθαγόρειος, Γοργίειος, Κλεινίειος, Μινύειος, Νικίειος.*

Κρήτη.

It might be thought that nothing was more certain than the form of the adjective of this word. *Κρηταῖος* is in Callim. hymn. I 34 and III 41 and Apoll. Rhod. II 1233 and IV 1694; it is inculcated by Seruius at Aen. III 117 '*Cretaeis* quia *Κρήτη*, ideo Cretaeis ut Aetnaeis' and by Priscian G. L. K. II p. 70 whom I cited on p. 55; it is alone recognised in the dictionaries; and it is now printed by all editors of Virgil, Propertius, Seneca and the rest, by all editors of Ovid excepting one, and by that editor in all excepting one of Ovid's writings. But Merkel in his 2nd edition of the metamorphoses complains at VII 434 that the printers have set up *Cretaei* where he wanted to have *Cretei*, and adds 'IX 666 Herodianum secutus sum,' which we find to mean that he has there printed *Creteas*; in the stereotype edition he has carried his point and *Cretei* also stands at VII 434. But who is this Herodian? Listen to a short but instructive chapter in the history of human error.

'Herodianus' means Lentz vol. I p. 134 l. 8, where, sure enough, you may read a precept touching the accentuation of *θήρειος, μήλειος, χήνειος, κήλειος ὁ καυστικὸς*, Κρήτειος. But the notes at the foot of the text will disclose that Κρήτειος is not in Arcadius' excerpts from the *καθολικὴ προσῳδία* but is one of Lentz's innumerable interpolations from Stephanus Byzantius: 'Κρήτειος addidi ex St. B. 384 7.' Only it is not in Stephanus either. Κρηταῖος is there (and thence has also found its way into 'Herodian,' Lentz II p. 874 25), but not Κρήτειος. Stephanus s. u. Κρήτη has these words, *λέγεται καὶ* Κρὴς Κρητὸς *καὶ* Κρῆσσα· *καὶ* Κρηταῖος *καὶ θηλυκῶς καὶ οὐδετέρως· καὶ* Κρητεὺς *καὶ* Κρητῆος *καὶ* Κρητήιος *κτητικόν*; and Κρήτειος is nothing but one of Meineke's two conjectures (the other is Κρητηις) for this Κρητῆος. I myself should write Κρητεὺς [*καὶ*] Κρητῆος, like Κρὴς Κρητός above.

But see the vigour and contagiousness of falsehood. Chandler in the 2nd edition of his Greek Accentuation imports into his § 381 this figment of a Κρήτειος, and Merkel finds fault with his printers, as Balaam with his ass, for resisting its importation into Ovid. Oh, if truth too would shoot up so like the beanstalk and fly abroad so like the plague!

Κύδωνες.

Ouid. art. I 293 *Cydoneae* edd.; met. VIII 22 *Cydoneas* edd., but *-aeas* Ehwald; Sil. II 109 *Cydoneo* edd.: X 260 *Cydonea* edd.; Stat. Theb. IV 269 *Cydonea* edd.: VII 339 *Cydoneas* edd. At Stat. Theb. IV 269 the best MS has *-ea* but many others *-aea*: in the remaining places the reading of the MSS is not explicitly stated.

The thes. ling. Lat. has not yet arrived at CYD-, so we lose the guidance of a will-o'-the-wisp. Georges gives *Cydoneus*, and so do Lewis and Short, but Κυδωναῖος is in Steph. Byz. and in Nonn. Dionys. XIII 226, XXXIII 374, XLVIII 969.

Κυδώνειος is properly formed; but neither Κύδωνες nor Κυδωνία has any business to make Κυδωναῖος, which, as Meineke says, would seem to imply Κυδώνη. The authority

of Greek MSS for *-αιος* against *-ειος* is much stronger than that of Latin MSS for *-eus* against *-aeus*; but all the Greek examples are very late.

Κυλλήνη.

Catull. 68 109 Pheneum prope *Cylleneum.*
-eum codd. and edd., but *-aeum* Passeratius.
Hor. epod. 13 9 fide *Cyllenea.*
-ea or *-a* codd., *-aea* codd. Porphyrionis, *-ea* edd.
Ouid. art. III 147 hanc placet ornari testudine *Cyllenea.*
-ea edd.
Ouid. met. XI 304 ille suis Delphis, hic uertice *Cylleneo.*
-eo edd., but *-aeo* Heinsius.
Germ. frag. IV 137 quandoquidem exortus ignis quoque *Cylleneus.*
-eus codd. and Bachrens, *quotiens Cyllenius ignis* most edd.
Lact. phoen. 50 nec *Cylleneae* fila canora lyrae.
-eae codd. and edd.
Auien. Arat. 1116 cedit lyra *Cyllenaea.*
-aea and *-aee* codd., *-aea* edd.

Cylleneus Georges, Lewis and Short; but the true form is preserved in Arat. 597 Λύρη...Κυλληναίη (in Hippon. frag. 16 Κυλλήνειε is only a conjecture and the MS reading is Κυλλήνιε[1]). In the Classical Review for 1900, p. 38 *b*, I quoted Aratus and remarked that the *Cylleneus* now current in Latin texts is a false form; and Quicherat in his thesaurus poeticus had already observed 'non bene scrib. *Cylleneus.*'

[1] A. Klotz, Glotta III p. 237, 'Es ist ein durchaus unmethodisches Verfahren, wenn die neuere Kritik die von Heliodor festgestellte Tatsache durch Einführung ungriechischer Formen (Κυλληναΐε Meineke, Κυλλήνειε Welcker) beseitigt, für deren Existenz die lateinische Bildung *Cylleneus* nicht das Geringste beweisen kann.' This is the sort of thing which scholars usually write when they begin to deal in phrases like 'durchaus unmethodisch.' Mr Klotz calls Κυλληναῖος 'ungriechisch' because he does not find it in the lexicons: it was used, as we see, by Aratus, and it would be unimpeachable Greek if it had never been used by anybody. He calls *Cylleneus* a Latin formation, which is just what it cannot be: it is either a Greek formation or an error of the scribes.

Δράγγαι.

Val. Fl. VI 106 insequitur *Drangaea* phalanx.

Drancea cod., *-caea* or *-gaea* edd.

Val. Fl. VI 507 iamque omnis Hiber *Drangaea*que densa strage cadit legio.

Dratia corr. in *Drantia* cod., *-caea* or *-gaea* edd.

No Greek example is cited. *Drangaeus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

Δραγγαῖος would be the adjective of ἡ Δραγγή Strab. XI p. 514, but the much commoner οἱ Δράγγαι will give the adjective Δράγγειος, and the Vaticanus points to the two Latin spellings of the latter, Drangea (Drancea) VI 106 and Drangia (Drancia) 507.

Ἔχιδνα.

Ouid. met. VII 408 illud *Echidneae* memorant e dentibus ortum | esse canis.

-eae edd. *Echidneus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

Analogy, Greek authority, Latin authority, all require Echidnaeae. ξεῖνος Ἐχιδναῖον νέρθεν ἄγων δάκετον Callim. etym. magn. p. 245 31, ἐχιδναίῳ...χόλῳ anth. Pal. VII 71 2 (Gaetulicus), *echidnaeos* carm. Lat. epigr. Engstroem 333 B 6 (Not. d. sc. 1903 p. 462).

Ἔφυρα.

Prop. II 6 1 non ita complebant *Ephyreae* Laidos aedes.

-eae codd. and edd.

Ouid. art. I 335 cui non defleta est *Ephyraeae* flamma Creusae?

-aeae edd.

Luc. VI 17 insedit castris *Ephyrea*que moenia seruat.

-ea edd., but *-aea* Weise (who in many respects is Lucan's most careful editor) and Francken.

Sil. XIV 52 et multum ante alias *Ephyraeis* fulget alumnis.

-aeis edd.

Sil. XIV 180 *Ephyraea* ad moenia uertit.

-aea edd.

Stat. Theb. II 207 Partheniosque super saltus *Ephyraea*que rura.

-ea P, *-aea* edd.

Stat. Theb. VI 253 *Ephyraeo* in litore.

-eo P and Garrod, *-aeo* edd.

Stat. Theb. VII 105 iam pronis Gradiuus equis *Ephyraea* premebat | litora.

-aea edd., but *-ea* Garrod, perhaps with P.

Ephyraeus or *Ephyreus* Georges and Lewis and Short, to please everybody.

Nonnus Dionys. XX 390 may write Ἐφύρειος if he will, but the true form is Ephyraeus: Pind. Pyth. X 85 Ἐφυραίων ὅπ' ἀμφὶ Πηνειὸν γλυκεῖαν προχεόντων ἐμάν, Theocr. XVI 83 πολυκλήρων Ἐφυραίων. It is possible that the editors of Propertius and Lucan have been misled by the existence of '*Ephyreia*que aera' in Verg. georg. II 464 and the supposition that Ἐφυρήιος implies Ἐφύρειος or Ἐφυρεῖος. But the Ionic *-ηιος* is the equivalent of *-αιος* no less than of *-ειος*: Εὐρώπη Εὐρωπαῖος Εὐρωπήιος, Ζάγκλη Ζαγκλαῖος Ζαγκλήιος, Τεμέση Τεμεσαῖος Τεμεσήιος, Φοίβη Φοιβαῖος Φοιβήιος, Παγασαί Παγασαῖος Παγασήιος, Νῦσα Νυσαῖος Νυσήιος, Σκύλλα Σκυλλαῖος Σκυλλήιος (el. in Maec. I 107 'Argo saxa pauens postquam *Scylleia* legit').

Εὐφράτης.

I do not know that the adjective occurs either in Greek or in Latin, but it has twice been introduced by conjecture, and both times in a form which is anomalous and presumably false. At Stat. silu. II 2 122 'Troica et *Euphratae* supra diademata felix' Gronouius proposed *Euphrataea*, and at Val. Fl. VI 696 'ipse *pharetratis* residens ad frena tapetis' Mr Sudhaus proposes and Mr O. Kramer accepts *Euphrataeis*; Georges and Lewis and Short give shelter to the word and provide it with a Greek original Εὐφραταῖος unknown to Greek lexicographers. If editors follow analogy in *Oronteus* and *Mithridateus* they should follow it also in Euphrateus.

Ἔννα.

Ouid. met. v 385 *Hennaeis*, ex Pont. ii 10 25 *Hennaeos* (*-eos* codd.), Luc. vi 293 *Hennaeis* (al. *Aetnaeis*), 740 *Hennaea*, Colum. x 270 *Hennaei*, Sil. i 93 *Hennaeae*, 214 *Hennaea*, ii 304 *Hennaeas*, v 489 *Hennaea*, vii 689 *Hennaea*, xiii 431 *Hennaeae*, xiv 50 *Hennaeis*, 245 *Hennaea*, Stat. Theb. iv 124 *Hennaeae* (*-eae* P), Ach. i 151 *Hennaeas* (*Aetneas* codd.), Claud. rapt. Pros. i 122 *Hennaeae* (*-eae* codd.). *Hennaeus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

The Greek is Ἐνναῖος, Diod. Sic. xiv 14 6 etc., and all the world is now at one, except that the latest English editors of Statius make him spell the word wrong in the Thebais and right in the Achilleis.

Ἑρμιόνη.

Ciris 472 hinc statio contra patet *Hermionea*.

-ea cod. opt. and edd.

No Greek example is cited. Lewis and Short have *Hermioneus*, Georges nothing.

The usual name of the town both in Greek and in Latin is *Hermione*, whose adjective should be *Hermionaeus*. But it was also called Ἑρμιών, gen. *-όνος*, from which Ἑρμιόνειος would be correctly derived.

Ὑψιπύλη.

Ouid. fast. iii 82 Volcanum tellus *Hypsipylea* colit.

-ea edd., but *-aea* Heinsius.

No Greek example is cited. *Hypsipyleus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

The adjective of Hypsipyle must be Hypsipylaeus, just as that of *πύλη* is *πυλαῖος*. It is true that Pindar Ol. iv 36 and Apollonius Rhodius call the heroine Ὑψιπύλεια, and that Ὑψιπύλειος, as I explained under Βερενίκη, might be formed from this; but to Ovid, as to the Latins in general, she is always Hypsipyle (her. vi 8, 59, 132, 153, xvii 193, amor. ii 18 33, met. xiii 398, Ib. 483).

Ἰανθίς.

Mart. XII 3 12 clarus *Iantheae* Stella sititor aquae.

The word is not in Georges nor in Lewis and Short, much to their credit: it ought to be in no lexicon and in no edition. This chapter will have less to do with the formation of adjectives than with the textual criticism of Martial.

Ἰανθίς properly makes Ἰανθίδειος; but Ἰάνθειος or Ἰανθεῖος, though anomalous, is not more anomalous than the substantives Σαραπεῖον Ἰσεῖον Ὀσιρεῖον or the adjective Ἡλεῖος, of which we receive this fanciful account: Steph. Byz. p. 301 Mein. ὁ πολίτης ἀπὸ τῆς Ἥλιδος γενικῆς ἀναλόγως Ἡλίδειος ὡς Ἀδωνίδειος καὶ Εὐπολίδειος κτητικῷ τύπῳ, καὶ καθ' ὕφεσιν τοῦ δ̄ Ἡλίειος καὶ Ἡλεῖος. So much being premised, what will the verse mean? The editors seem to have considered neither form nor sense.

Iantheae aquae is supposed to signify the same as VI 47 1 sq. 'nympha, mei Stellae quae fonte domestica puro | laberis et domini gemmea tecta subis,' VII 15 1 'nitidis...Ianthidos undis,' 50 1 'fons dominae, regina loci quo gaudet Ianthis.' It is therefore a fountain in Stella's grounds, dedicated to his wife Violentilla. Why should Stella be said to thirst for this water? and what is this water or any earthly water doing in this context?

> laurigeros habitat facundus Stella penates
> clarus ⏑ – – – Stella sititor aquae;
> fons ibi Castalius uitreo torrente superbit,
> unde nouem dominas saepe bibisse ferunt.

Here are Parnassus and Helicon and the world of metaphor: Stella aspires to poetical inspiration, and the fount for which he thirsts is Castaly or Aganippe. And Aganippe was once to be found in print upon this page of Martial: it was only removed by the importunity of Scriuerius ('toties totiesque monui, ut scribatur *Iantheae*, Ἰάνθειος') and the ill judgment of modern editors from Schneidewin onwards. Mr Lindsay's apparatus criticus leaves one to suppose that *Iantheae* is in all the MSS: it is probably in some, but it is not in any of the four

copies about which I have definite information. L indeed, the best MS of the family β, has *iamthee*, and P in the same family *yantheae*; but Q, a third member, together with E, the best of the family γ, has hyanteae, and gives just the sense required: Ouid. met. v 312 'Hyantea Aganippe.'

'Ιτουραῖοι or 'Ιτυραῖοι.

Verg. georg. II 448 *Ituraeos* taxi torquentur in arcus.
-aeos PRγ and edd., *-eos* Mc.
Luc. VII 230 *Ityraeis* cursus fuit inde sagittis.
-aeis edd., but *-eis* Hosius and Heitland.
Luc. VII 514 tunc et *Ityraei* Medique Arabesque soluti.
-aei edd.

Here is no question of formation or derivation, but simply of spelling the Greek word right in Latin. Why Mr Hosius, whom Mr Heitland follows in such matters, should spell it right in one verse of Lucan and wrong in another, I do not know, but I can guess: I suspect Montepessulanus H 113.

Λᾶγος.

Luc. I 684 qua mare *Lagaei* mutatur gurgite Nili.
-aei edd., but *-ei* Grotius, Weise, Francken.
Luc. VIII 692 ultima *Lageae* stirpis perituraque proles.
-eae edd.
Luc. X 394 praestet *Lagea* iuuentus.
-ea edd.
Luc. X 414 ausa foret *Lagea* domus.
-ea edd.
Luc. X 522 ut proles *Lagea* tenet.
-ea edd.
Sil. I 196 terminus huic roseos amnis *Lageus* ad ortus.
-eus edd.
Mart. X 26 4 hospita *Lagei* litoris umbra iaces.
-ei Gilbert, Lindsay, Duff, *-aei* Schneidewin and Friedlaender.

No Greek example is cited, and the substantive Λάγειον is not in itself decisive; but Lageus, as in Georges and Lewis and Short, is alone correct.

Λαπίθης.

Ouid. met. XII 525 o salue, dixit, *Lapithaeae* gloria gentis.
-aeae edd., but *-eae* Merkel.

No Greek example is cited, and the Laconian substantive Λαπίθαιον (*ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς...Λαπίθου* Paus. III 20 7: compare Λεωνίδαιον) proves no more on the one hand than the Ionian adjective Λαπιθήιος (Ouid. met. XII 417, XIV 670) on the other. *Lapithaeus* Georges, Lewis and Short: the true form is nevertheless Lapitheus.

Νιόβη.

Hor. carm. IV 6 1 proles *Niobea*.
-ea codd. and edd.

No Greek example is cited. *Niobeus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

If the editors of Horace mean to obey their MSS, they should print *Dioneo* carm. II 1 39, *Liparei* III 12 8, *Aegeos* III 29 63, *Letheos* epod. 14 3. If they prefer grammar in those places, they should prefer it in this, and write Niobaea.

Νῖσος.

Ouid. fast. IV 500 et uos, *Nisaei*, naufraga monstra, canes.
niferi A, *scyllei* V, *nisei* most codd., *-aei* edd.
Nisaeus Georges, Lewis and Short.

Νισαῖος is a Greek adjective, but it is the adjective of Νῖσα the town, Theocr. XII 27 Νισαῖοι Μεγαρῆες (for when the scholiast says *ὠνομάσθησαν ἀπὸ Νίσου τοῦ Πανδίονος* he is putting the cart before the horse and deriving *Romanus* from *Romulus*). The dogs of Scylla might legitimately be called *Nisaei* in this sense, but Ovid's MSS give no reason for thinking that he called them so: the *niferi* of the best authority looks most like *Niseii*, the Ionic form which he used in met. VIII 35 'uix sanae uirgo *Niseia* compos | mentis erat.' So since the proper adjective of Νῖσος is Νίσειος, Nisei should be printed here.

Παγασαί.

The Greek adjective is Παγασαῖος, Hes. scut. 70 etc., and *Pagasaeus* is rightly given by Georges and Lewis and Short, by the editors of Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Silius, and Statius, and by Ovid's editors at fast. v 401. But elsewhere in Ovid, though the latest editions have the true form, *Pagaseus* or *Pagasius* may be found in texts which are still current: Riese and Sedlmayer her. XVI 345, XIX 175, art. III 19, Merkel and Korn and Zingerle met. VIII 349, Merkel met. XII 412, XIII 24, fast. I 491.

Πηνελόπη.

Catull. 61 230 Telemacho manet | fama *Penelopeo*.
-eo codd. and edd., but *-aeo* Passeratius.
Ouid. trist. v 14 36 *Penelopea* fides.
-ea edd., but *-aea* Heinsius.

No Greek example is quoted, though Pape attributes to Catullus and Ovid the unmetrical form Πηνελοπήιος. *Penelopeus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

If *Penelopeus* existed, it could be derived, as Lobeck path. prol. p. 474 says it is, from the name Πηνελόπεια, which occurs in Latin at Priap. 68 28; but the MSS of Catullus and Ovid are no evidence that *Penelopeus* did exist, or that the two poets did not use Penelopaeus, regularly formed from the regular substantive.

Περιμήδη.

Prop. II 4 8 non hic herba ualet, non hic nocturna Cytaeis, | non *Perimedeae* gramina cocta manus.
per medeae codd., *Perimedeae* edd., *Perimedeu...manu* Muretus and others.

No Greek example is cited. *Perimedeus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

Perimedeu manus would mean the hand of Περιμήδης, who is not known to have meddled with witchcraft: the adjective of Περιμήδη will be Perimedaeus. To insert an *i* which is not in the MSS at all, and yet to stick at printing *ae* for *e*,

is indeed to swallow a camel and strain at a gnat. And these are the same editors who in the line above, with much less necessity, change the *cytheis* of the MSS to *Cytaeis*, though Κυτηίς lacks neither authority nor analogy.

Φιλίτας.

Prop. III 3 52 ora *Philetaea* nostra rigauit aqua.

Prop. IV 6 3 serta *Philetaeis* certet Romana corymbis.

-aea and *-aeis* most edd.

No Greek example is cited. *Phileteus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

At III 3 52 the MSS have Philitea, which is right in every letter; at IV 6 3 they have *Philippeis*, but this is corrected to Philiteis in Burmann's Vaticanus quintus. The old editors read *Philetea* and *Phileteis*, which are not so very wrong; but Burmann in 1780 introduced *Philetaeis* and Lachmann in 1816 *Philetaea*, and from that date the false form has appeared in every edition but one. Bergk pronounced in 1873 that the correct termination was *-eus*, but only Baehrens heeded his monition. The last stage of negligence is reached in Mr Hosius' edition of 1911: his text has *Philitea* at III 3 52 but *Philitaeis* at IV 6 3; his index, to exhaust the possibilities of inconstancy, gives *Philitaea* for the former verse but *Philiteis* for the latter.

Φρίξος or Φρῖξος.

No Greek example of the adjective is cited, for Φρίξειον in Strabo is a substantive and Φριξαῖος in Steph. Byz. is the adjective of Φρίξα; but *Phrixeus* is correctly given in the dictionaries and in editions of Ovid, Seneca, Lucan and others. The monstrosity *Phryxaei* was current in editions of Manilius (it is not in his MSS) at III 304 till I called attention to it in 1903 (ed. lib. I p. lxxiii), but appears no more in the one text issued since. Nor do I know of any place in any classical poet where the termination is now wrongly spelt; the stem however is still barbarous in Colum. X 155 *Phryxi*, 368 *Phryxeo*, anth. Lat. Ries. 239 6 *Phryxeae*.

Ῥοδόπη.

Luc. VI 618 aequoraque et campi *Rhodopea*que saxa loquentur.

-ea edd., but *-aea* Weise.

No Greek example is cited. *Rhodopeus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

I suppose that editors and lexicographers alike have been led astray by the much commoner and more familiar *Rhodopeius* of Verg. georg. IV 461, Ovid, Statius, Martial and others; but of that delusion I spoke under Ἔφυρα. The tetrasyllable must be Rhodopaeus.

Σεμέλη.

Stat. Theb. X 903 en cineres *Semelea*que busta tenentur.

-ea edd.

No Greek example is cited. *Semeleus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

Again the Ionic form, the *Semeleius* of Horace and Ovid, is probably at the bottom of the error. Write Semelaea.

Τισιφόνη.

Ouid. trist. IV 9 6 cupiasque eradere uitae | tempora, si possis, *Tisiphonea* tuae.

-ea edd., but *-aea* Heinsius.

No Greek example is cited. *Tisiphoneus* Georges, Lewis and Short.

Tisiphonaea in verse 6 is just as certain and necessary as *Lethaeis* in verse 2.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE LATINIZATIONS OF THE MODERN SURNAME.

Now that the history of Classical learning is being rewritten, a new mode of designating the scholars of a former age seems to be coming into fashion; the time-honoured names, by which they were so generally known to their learned contemporaries and to our own forefathers, are being as far as possible discarded, and replaced by others believed to represent the veritable form of their surnames in the various vernaculars. The new fashion has caught on so completely as to be followed at times even in the Latin notes in recent editions of classical texts; to be up-to-date, it appears, one should write 'emendavit Vettori,' or 'correxit Turnèbe'—with little regard for the feelings and instincts of those illustrious humanists. One objection to this procedure is the uncertainty of its application; we adopt the vernacular name, when we happen to know it (or think we know it), and we keep to the learned name, if the vernacular one eludes us, as it so often does. To recover the vernacular one—where recovery is possible—is in many instances no easy matter; it may require learning of a very special kind, some familiarity with the languages and the name-systems of different countries, and at different periods, and no little knowledge of the bypaths of literary history. But in the end the name thus painfully recovered may be only an inference or plausible surmise, unless it can be proved to be more than that by the researches of some curious antiquary amid the dust of archives. And one cannot forget, that after all the Latin names of the scholars of the first two centuries of the modern period are the *nobis notiora*, and that they have a long record of use and tradition.

Our earlier authorities for the history and biography of Classical learning are apt to be silent on the subject of the vernacular names of the old scholars, as though it were of very little interest to them or their readers. The new interest in the question may perhaps have been somewhat quickened with us by the example of Voigt in Germany and of J. A. Symonds in England; the notion being this apparently, that we should speak of these men of the past, as though we had known them in the flesh, not by the names under which they lived, and wished to live, in the world of Letters, but by others more familiar at the time to the man in the street or, perhaps, the local notary—if that was generally the fact, which I venture to doubt. We are now expected, accordingly, to refer to the author of *Hermaphroditus* as Beccadelli, though in his own day, in the world in which he was a personage, he was Antonius Panormita, or, as his contemporary Vespasiano calls him in Italian, Antonio Panormita. Politian has been treated with more consideration. He became in Latin Politianus (Politianus, from Mons Politianus, the learned name of his birthplace), and thence in Italian Poliziano; this last has remained too well established to be replaced in Voigt by the earlier Agnolo Montepulciano—which still survives as his name in Machiavelli. There are ominous signs, however, of our having to reconcile ourselves to a new appellative, now that our librarians have learnt that his family name was probably Ambrogini; I have seen his works put under that heading in a library catalogue, just as those of Voltaire have been entered before now under 'Arouet.'

Italian surnames.

One naturally begins with these, because the Italian humanists were the first in the field of the New Learning. Without attempting any formal classification of Italian surnames, I suppose one may assume certain obvious distinctions, as sufficient at least for present purposes.

Latinized surnames of local origin present but little difficulty in the case of Italy, as the Latin place-names from which

they come are as a rule easily discoverable in the old geographical dictionaries. But in the form of certain of these names there is this to be noted, that an Italian or other place-name ending in *-a* may be turned into a Neolatin surname without change of termination, in the same way as in Vespasiano's Italian Domenico *of* Capranica is Domenico Capranica, and George *of* Trebizond, Giorgio Trabizonda; e.g.

Nicolas of Cusa (i.e. Cues): Nicolaus Cusa, in Palmerius; more usually in after times Nicolaus Cusanus.

Giovanni della Casa: Ioannes Casa.

Pico della Mirandola: Picus Mirandula; sometimes Picus Mirandulanus.

As for the countless Italian surnames ending in *-i*, some of these were patronymics, the genitives of baptismal names ending in *-us* or *-o*. Vasari tells us that the painter Taddeo Bartoli was the son of a certain Bartolo, and that Lippi stood for 'De Lippo,' the son of Lippo (i.e. Filippo). Others—though in many instances originally patronymics—were in actual use gentile names; and as such they were regarded as plurals. Thus 'Alberti' was short for 'degli Alberti,' in notarial Latin 'de Albertis,' of the Alberti family; 'Salutati' for 'de' Salutati'; and 'Pandolphini' for 'de Pandolphinis.' Both kinds of surnames were Latinized in exactly the same way.

With patronymics the usual practice in the 15th century was to Latinize them by direct reversion to the father's name, i.e. by turning the vernacular *-i* into *-us*. In the correspondence of Leonardus Aretinus (2 p. 172 Mehus) is a letter to Colucius, who had addressed him as Leonardus 'Ceccus,' his vernacular name being Lionardo 'Cecchi' or 'di Cecco.' This he strongly resents as a misleading and unclassical rendering of his second name; in spite of that, however, he was quite ready to follow the general practice in the case of others; he speaks, for instance, of Jacopo di Agnolo as 'Jacobus Angelus'—not as 'Jacobus Angeli filius,' as he should have done, if the rule laid down to Colucius was to be observed. So also Perotti was Perottus in contemporary Latin; and I suppose it was from this that there arose even in his own time (e.g. in Vespasiano) a new form of his surname, 'Perotto.'

The treatment of gentile names was equally simple. A 'de' Salutati,' one of the Salutati family, was known as 'Salutatus' —a form sanctioned by Leonardus Aretinus. Hence he came to be often called in Italian 'Salutato,' which Voigt has canonized as normal. So also the famous Nicola Nicoli became in Latin Nicolaus Nicolus (e.g. in Facius and Cortesius), though the 'Nicoli' was so distinctly recognized as a plural that the official Latin for it was 'de Nicolis.' I subjoin a few more instances:

Acciaiuoli: Acciaiolus.

Bellini: Bellinus.

Grimaldi: Grimaldus.

Landini: Landinus. Hence the other form of the name, Landino.

Orsini: Ursinus. Fulvius Ursinus, not unfrequently became in contemporary correspondence 'Orsino'—a form we may remember as occurring also in Shakespere.

Pinelli: Pinellus. In his own time J. V. Pinelli was often called 'Pinello.'

The name of the Medici house has a history of its own. It was in Italian 'de' Medici,' and in official Latin 'de Medicis.' But elegant Latinity created a new form, 'Medices,' a third declension word; in contemporary Greek, too, the form was Μεδίκης (with Μεδίκων as a gen. pl.). This, however, is not the end of the story. 'Medices' is constantly used as an indeclinable noun by Renaissance Latinists, e.g. by Palmerius, Merula, Polydore Vergil, and also the Aristotelian Niphus, who was proud of the licence to add 'Medices' as a second surname after his own. In later Neolatin the current word was 'Mediceus.'

To pass on to other artifices of Latinization of a more obviously mechanical order.

Names ending in *-a*. The ending remains as it was in a large number of surnames, e.g. in Auria (= Doria), Columna (= Colonna), Gonzaga, Mantinea (= Mantegna), Spinula (= Spinola), Stroza. But Sforza became either Sphortia or Sphortias, and occasionally Sphorcius—just as L. Pignoria is on the title-pages of his books 'Pignorius.' The form 'Sphortias' was, I suppose, due to a desire to give the word a Greek look, on the

analogy of Archias, Gorgias and the like. Other instances of the same affectation will be noted further on.

Names ending in *-e*. Many of these could be Latinized at once by reversion to the Latin original, a Gentile becoming thus 'Gentilis,' and a Mercuriale, 'Mercurialis.' Sigone, it may be observed, was in Latin Sigonius; and it was from that that the more usual Italian name 'Sigonio' was formed. That his vernacular name was Sigone (as it is, for instance, in Castelvetro) has been clearly shown by Rénouard (*Alde*[3] pp. 166 and 238).

Names ending in *-i*. These, except in certain cases already considered, usually end in Neolatin in *-ius*; e.g.

Allacci: Allatius. Hence his other Italian name, Allatio or Allacio.

Beni: Benius.

Fazi (or Fazio): Facius.

Galluzzi: Gallutius.

Nicoli: Nicolius—the conventional later Latinization of the surname of Nicola Nicoli.

Patrizi: Patritius, or Patricius.

Pazzi (or de' Pazzi): Pactius, or Paccius.

Varchi: Varchius.

Vettori: Victorius—not 'Vectorius,' as one might have expected.

When, however, an *-i* name had another *-i-* as its antepenultimate, the latter was usually dropped. Benevieni thus became 'Benevenius,' and Palmieri, 'Palmerius,' in the same way as in an earlier period Alighieri was 'Aligerius.'

Names ending in *-io*. The normal Neolatin ending for them was *-ius*, so that Boccaccio became Boccatius; Masaccio, Masaccius. But Bentivolio was turned into Bentivolus, on the analogy, one may presume, of the Latin *benivolus*.

Names ending in *-o* preceded by a consonant other than *r*. The *-o* was then simply changed into *-us*, Bembo becoming Bembus; Filelfo, Philelphus; Giotto, Jottus; Nifo, Niphus; Tasso, Tassus. When the ending was *-ro*, however, the usual practice was to make the Latin name end in *-rius*, as in the following instances:—

Castelvetro: Castelvetrius. So Robortellus[1] in the preface to his Aeschylus. But with others Castelvetro was Castelvetrus, or even Castelvitreus.

Fracastoro: Fracastorius—from which he was sometimes re-Italianized into 'Fracastorio' (as in Castelvetro).

Navagero, or Navagiero: Navagerius (so in Pierius Valerianus), Navigerius, or Naugerius—this last being re-Italianized into Naugerio.

In some instances the vernacular name was too refractory to admit of a respectable Latin adaptation. The Aristotelian commentator L. Boccadiferro actually appears on his title-pages as Buccaferrea, or Buccaferreus, with a gen. Buccaeferrei (!): it must have required some philosophy to acquiesce in such a barbarism. In the Renaissance period, accordingly, the difficulty was often got over by simply sacrificing the vernacular name, and putting a translation, or what might pass as a translation, in its place. Thus a Bevilacqua became 'Abstemius'; a Della Paglia, 'Palearius'; a Fortiguerra, 'Carteromachus.' In some instances the excuse for having recourse to translation does not seem equally legitimate. It was mere affectation of Classicalism that made a Riccio call himself 'Crinitus,' and led Leonardus Aretinus to rename a Rossi (or de' Rossi) 'Ruffus.'

The affectation of Classicalism did not always stop at surnames; it extended even to praenomens, which were sometimes with no little audacity of invention made to assume a pseudo-antique form. Thus it was that Valerianus of Belluno, who began life as Pietro or Piero, changed his baptismal name into 'Pierius.' Another Italian, Antonio della Paglia, masqueraded as 'Aonius' Palearius—he was eventually burnt, but not for that. Another, Majoragius or Majoraggio (if that was his real surname), turned his baptismal Antonio Maria into 'Marcus Antonius,' for which he was duly pilloried by Castelvetro. And the illustrious Cosma de' Medici, in Latin Cosmas Medices, by

[1] In an earlier book he had called himself Robertelius, which may perhaps presuppose a vernacular Robortelli. If so, Robortellus and Robortello will be another instance of direct reversion to the Christian name of a father or ancestor (see p. 78).

the alteration of a letter became 'Cosmus' in Latin, and 'Cosmo' in Italian, thus divesting himself of his original association with Saint Cosmas, which was a great point in that semi-pagan age.

Spanish and Portuguese surnames.

Perhaps the first thing that strikes one in Spanish Latin is its retention in so many instances of the vernacular names in their native form without any pretence of giving them a Latin one. Names like Delrio and De la Cerda are to be seen in the title-pages of well-known scholars of Spanish origin.

A great many Spanish surnames are ordinary place-names turned into personal names. The full name of the illustrious Spanish Aristotelian was Genesius de Sepulveda; but he dropped the preposition, and became simply Genesius Sepulveda, the second name being then declined straight off like *musa*. Spanish Latinity abounds in names of the same type, e.g. Avila, Guevara, Spinosa (= de Espinosa), Stunica, Vergara, and the like. Sepulveda even uses old Latin place-names in this way, turning, for instance, a Juan de Cordova into 'Joannes Corduba.' But he went even further than that; for one can hardly doubt that the 'Sebastianus Leo' with whom he corresponded was in real life Sebastian de Leon, i.e. of the city of Leon. Not so long after his time, Ponce de Leon may be seen figuring on a title-page as 'Pontius Leo.'

Other surnames, however, of local signification, were modified in various ways to make them pass as Latin; e.g.

De Castro: Castrensis.

De Escobar: Scobarius (also Scobar, Scobar-is).

De Gouvea: Goveanus—not simply Govea, as one might have expected.

De Horozco: Oroscius.

De Resende: Resendius.

De Torres: Turrianus.

I may add that when a vernacular name could pass muster as a Latin nominative, it was used as that without hesitation. Thus Morales was in Latin 'Morales' (gen. -is) and Vives

'Vives' (gen. -is). Valles, however, became—in certainly one instance—'Vallesius.'

Spanish surnames ending in *-ez* (all originally patronymics, I understand) were regularly Latinized by direct substitution of *-ius* for the final *-ez*; e.g.

Gonzalez: Gonsalius.

Nuñez: Nonius or Nonnius—from the old name Nunno or Nuño.

Olivarez: Olivarius.

Sanchez: Sanctius.

Ximenez: Ximenius.

But a Gomez became 'Gomecius,' an Alvarez 'Alvarus.' And the Nuñez, whom we remember as an editor of Phrynichus, elected to be known as 'Nunnesius.'

A few more names may be added here—just enough to show the principle or no-principle on which Latin surnames may have been constructed in the Peninsula:—

Abril: Aprileus.

Cabedo: Cabedius.

Estaço: Statius.

Fox: Foxius.

García: Garsia, or Garsias—the latter perhaps on the model of Archias, Prusias etc. So also Mexía was sometimes Latinized into 'Messias.'

Mariner: Marinerius.

Pereira: Pererius.

Teve: Tevius.

The only instance I have observed of direct translation is 'Dryander,' to represent the Spanish 'Encinas.'

French surnames.

These are often so intractable that great liberties might have to be taken to give them a Latin look; the result being that it is sometimes hardly possible for us in this day to recognize the original name in its learned disguise. De Thou's Latinizations of contemporary names, though not without system, must have been from the first a perplexity to his

readers; and the generation that came after him had reason to be thankful for the interpretations inserted in the Index volume of 1634. I may observe that the French scholars of the 17th century seem to have been keenly interested in the question of the Latinized surname; there is a whole chapter on it in the *Huetiana,* and not a few notes and criticisms scattered up and down the *Menagiana.* Scaliger also had had quite definite views on the subject (*Scaligerana* p. 288 ed. 1740).

It must not be supposed, however, that the French Latinizations are always so abnormal as to leave the underlying vernacular name unrecognizable. Many of them are simply the vernacular name with the inflexional affix *-us* or *-ius*—no doubt often with the change of a letter or two in the body of the word.

With the affix *-us* :—

Du Bellay: Bellaius.

Du Billy: Billius.

Boulenger: Bulengerus.

Grouchy: Gruchius.

Herauld: Heraldus.

Hurault: Huraltus.

Muret: Muretus.

But Rigault was 'Rigaltius'; and Huet 'Huetius'—though he tells us himself that 'Huetus' would have been the more correct form for his surname.

With the affix *-ius* :—

Bongars: Bongarsius.

Du Cange: Cangius.

Cujas: Cuiacius.

Du Hamel: Hamelius.

Loisel: Oiselius.

Gu. Morel: Morelius. But Fr. Morel was 'Morellus.'

Petau: Petavius.

Rabelais: Rabelaesius; sometimes Rabelaesus.

Saumaise: Salmasius.

When the vernacular name ends in *-ier,* the *-i-* usually disappears in the Latin :—

Champier: Champerius.
Chartier: Charterius.
Dacier: Dacerius.
Fournier: Fornerius.

Le Paulmier: Palmerius. But the father of the famous Jacques le Paulmier called himself 'Palmarius,' as being more like Latin, I suppose.

Peletier: Peletarius.

There are, however, some few notable exceptions to the rule. Grolier became 'Grolierius,' Josias Mercier 'Mercerus,' and Seguier 'Seguierius'—instead of Grolerius, Mercerius and Seguerius, as analogy might lead one to expect.

A curious divergence of practice arose with French names ending in *-on*, which were Latinized sometimes as second, and sometimes as third declension words. Thus Brisson was usually 'Brissonius,' and Du Perron 'Perronius.' But Fronton du Duc was always, if I am not mistaken, 'Fronto Ducaeus.' Scaliger followed this latter mode of Latinization, calling Manert Patisson, for instance, not Patissonius (as was usual) but 'Patisso': even his English friend, Richard Thomson of Cambridge, was with him 'Thomso,' and Sir Henry Wotton in like manner 'Wotto.' With Beza also 'Hamilto' does duty for our Hamilton. Casaubon generally follows the same rule, though not in the case of his own name. The practice in fact was an affectation: and it soon went out in France.

It is to be observed that a French surname ending in *-é* or *-ée* became in normal Neolatin one ending in *-eus* or *-aeus*:—

Budé: Budeus (or Budaeus).
Finé: Fineus (or Finaeus).
Labbé: Labbaeus.
Naudé: Naudaeus.
Strebée: Strebaeus.

The Latin ending *-aeus*, however, sometimes corresponds to a vernacular *-eau*:—

Brodaeus: Brodeau.
Coteraeus: Cotereau (Ménage, *Anti-Baillet* 1 p. 256).
Susannaeus: Susaneau.

The foregoing are all instances of a more or less mechanical adaptation, and were made according to some sort of rule and precedent. But there are countless Latinizations in which the underlying French name is not so immediately recognizable.

Some of these were a revival of Latin originals; e.g.

Carpentarius: Charpentier.

Christianus: Chrestien.

Clericus: Leclerc.

Faber: Lefebvre.

Gothofredus: Godefroy.

Olivarius: Olivier.

Stephanus[1]: Estienne.

Others were translations pure and simple; e.g.

Castellanus: Duchastel. Baluze, writing in 1674, tells us that at that time Duchastel was often called Castellan or Chastellain, through a misunderstanding of the Latin name, the memory of the true vernacular having been lost. He might have added that a century before that, H. Estienne in one of his French writings had spoken of Duchastel as 'Castellan.'

Insulanus: de l'Isle (Delisle).

Macarius: L'Heureux.

Parvus: Petit. So with the famous printer, Jean Petit. But his example was not followed by Pierre or Samuel Petit in the next century.

Puteanus: Du Puy. A mistranslation, as Scaliger shows in the *Scaligerana*.

Regius: Le Roy.

Silvius: Du Bois.

Others were newly-coined words with a certain show of etymological affinity to the vernacular name; e.g.

Castanaeus: Chasteigner.

Portaeus: Desportes.

Quercetanus: Duchesne.

Sudorius: Le Sueur.

Tilius: Du Tillet.

[1] Stephanus was very soon Anglicized into Stephens; and it is as Stephens that Henri Estienne is known in the pages of Bentley and Porson.

Casaubon began his literary life as 'Hortusbonus,' in lieu of which enemies fashioned a new name for him, 'Hortibonus,' through a misreading of the title-page of his Notes on Diogenes Laertius. I have seen a copy of the book, which he sent to Pinelli at the time, with an autograph dedication signed 'Is. Hortusbonus.'

Too many French Latin surnames, however, simply defy classification owing to the difficulty of explaining their form or structure. The most one can do with them in any brief statement is to recognize them as facts, without discussion. But a combination of pedantry and caprice will certainly account for no small proportion of them. The following are some few out of a very large number of possible instances:—

Brixius: De Brie (*Menagiana* 1 p. 132).

Colinaeus: De Colines.

Colomesius: Colomiés.

Ducaeus: Du Duc.

Foxius: Du Foix.

Iunius: Du Jon.

Memmius: De Mesme.

Paschasius: Pasquier.

Possinus: Poussines.

Ramus: De la Ramée.

Sammarthanus: De Sainte-Marthe.

Sangelasius: De Saint-Gelais.

Talaeus: Talon.

Thuanus: De Thou. Scaliger disapproved of the form (*Scaligerana* p. 289).

Tiraquellus: Tiraqueau.

Torinus: Tory.

Apart from any questions or difficulties that may arise in connexion with the foregoing specimens of the French Latinized surname, I think it may be as well to draw attention to two points of some historical interest.

1. The learned names were in some instances so generally accepted and familiar in France as to be freely used even in ordinary vernacular writings. Marot addressed Duchastel as 'Monsieur Castellanus' (*Menagiana* 4 p. 123); and Henri IV,

Scaliger, as 'Monsieur Scaliger,'—not as 'Monsieur de l'Escale.' Montaigne also speaks of 'Silvius' and 'Turnebus,' both of them fellow-countrymen and his contemporaries. As for foreign scholars, we find him constantly referring to them by their Latinized names, as was indeed the general custom with the educated classes in those days, and long after that. Even in our own time it is more usual in France to say 'Ramus' than 'De la Ramée.'

2. The Latinized being in some instances so much more widely known than the original surnames, new surnames adapted from the Latin came into general use, the older forms of the names passing out of memory. There are certainly some very noteworthy instances of this:—

Beza. His original name is said to have been De Besie (Ménage, *Anti-Baillet* 2 p. 114). This being Latinized into 'Beza,' he became henceforth Bèze or De Bèze in French even in his own day.

Calvin. There is good reason to think that he began life as Chauvin, and Latinized that, correctly enough, as 'Calvinus.' 'Calvin,' therefore, would seem to be a back-formation from the Latin.

Turnebus. His family name was De Tournebu, so called from a village in Normandy. He Latinized it himself into 'Turnĕbus' (in Greek Τούρνεβος); not a few of his contemporaries, however, turned this into 'Turnēbus,' and starting from that fabricated a new French name for him, Turnèbe. So that he is now commonly known in France and elsewhere by a surname which is two removes from the truth.

Dutch, Flemish, and German surnames.

These are a perpetual difficulty to an outsider. I have had to rely to a considerable extent on such information as one finds in books like Bursian's *Geschichte*, Eckstein's *Nomenclator*, and Pökel's *Schriftsteller-Lexikon*, not without an uneasy feeling in my own mind that it is not always to be trusted.

Germany in the early days of the Renaissance resembled Spain in one respect; it was still not unusual for surnames to

retain their vernacular form even in Latin books—no doubt often with a baptismal name, or some other declinable word, prefixed, so as to bring the barbarous word into some semblance of construction. Instances may be seen in Reuclin's Correspondence passim. Reuclin himself was thus 'Ioannes Reuclin,' more rarely 'Reuclinus'; with those, however, who affected the new elegance the mode was to call him by his Greek pseudonym, 'Capnion.' But the fashion of the Latinized name soon made its way, and spread far and wide over Northern Europe; so much so that there are to this day not a few survivals of it in Germany—names like Cantor, Crusius, Curtius, Emperius[1], Faber, Fabricius[2], with others also of patronymic form like Alberti, Ernesti, Matthiae, Michaelis, Ulrici. One would wish to know how and when it was that the remote ancestors of those now bearing these surnames came to adopt them.

That pseudonyms should abound in these regions was but natural; the temptation was great to devise a new surname of Latin, or better still, of Greek origin, to take the place of an amorphous or ill-sounding native name. The pseudonyms are known, but that cannot always be said of the vernacular names they supplanted; these are often a matter of conjecture, about which a difference of opinion is quite possible. The following may perhaps serve as types of the more convincing identifications:—

Chimerinus: Winter.
Crato: Krafft.
Fortis: Stercke.
Grapheus: Schryver.
Iunius: De Jonge.
Luscinius: Nachtigall.
Oporinus: Herbst.
Virulus: Meniken (our 'mannikin'). Carolus Virulus, one of the early humanists in the Low Countries, was strictly Carolus Viruli, i.e. Charles Menkens (comp. Copinger, *Suppl. to Hain* 2, 1, p. 387–9)—the 'Virulus' in his case being a

[1] 'Emper' is the fiction of some recent English editors of texts.

[2] It will be remembered that there was a 'Helvetius' even in France in the 18th cent.—the name being inherited from a German ancestor.

reversion of a kind common enough at the time in Italy (*v.* p. 78). In this respect, therefore, the name may be compared—if a digression be permissible—with that of the Louvain printer whom we are now required to call Thierry Martens. He began as Dirck Martens, 'Dirck son of Martin,' in Latin Theodoricus Martini (as he is in some of his earlier books); but after a time dropped the patronymic form of his second name and called himself Theodoricus Martinus. As for the Christian name Thierry, I must observe that it is not Flemish but French, and due, one may suppose, to the French-speaking Belgian literati.

To pass on to the ordinary mechanical artifice for Latinization, the addition of *-us* or *ius* to the original name.

With the affix *-us* :—

Canter: Canterus.

Gesner: Gesnerus.

Hartung: Hartungus.

Hutten: Huttenus.

Schott: Schottus.

Volcmar (?): Volmārus, Volmărus; sometimes also Volmārius (all three to be found in Beza's Latin poems).

With the affix *-ius* :—

Froben: Frobenius (i.e. of Froben).

Goclen: Goclenius.

Groot: Grotius.

Giffen: Giphanius.

Löwenklau: Leunclavius.

Schryver: Scriverius.

Sturm: Sturmius.

'Holstenius,' however, which is so commonly equated with 'Holsten,' may very well have represented Holst or Holste, in the same way as 'Noltenius' was Nolte, and 'Menckenius' Mencke.

In some instances the affix *-ius* takes the place of a final *-e* in the native name :—

Graeve or Greffe: Graevius[1].

[1] Bentley, who kept up a regular correspondence with him, always calls him by his Latin name even in his English writings. He does the same with Gronovius (Gronow ?), and also more often than not with Vossius.

Schoppe: Schoppius; afterwards (as a concession to the Italians) Scioppius—just as the Spanish scholar Chacón became in Italy Ciacconius.

The ending *-ius*, however, seems to correspond in some instances to a Flemish or German patronymic form in *-s*, the meaning of which was not yet forgotten. Thus Rubenius is the Latin for Rubens. And one can hardly doubt that Guilielmius, the name of the great Plautine scholar, represented 'Guilielmi,' or 'Wilhelms.' If 'Gevartius' stands for a Flemish 'Gevaerts,' it is clear that this mode of adaptation was not confined to derivatives from Christian names.

But Rutgers (our Rodgers) called himself Rutgersius—an ugly word to my thinking. One wonders what Scaliger would have said of it.

The following Latinizations are much too arbitrary to admit of classification:—

Buslidius, or Buslidianus: Busleyden.
Clenardus: Cleynaerts.
Crusius: Kraus.
Hunnaeus: Huens.
Longolius: Longueil.
Nannius: Nanninck.
Puteanus: de Put.
Rescius: Ressen.

And there are many others of the same fanciful order, more especially in the Low Countries. I observe that so learned a writer as M. F. Nève is evidently at a loss at times to recover even by conjecture the vernacular names of some of the earlier professors at Louvain.

English Surnames.

Here one is on firmer ground, not only because the English surnames are already familiar to us, but also because the relation between them and their Latinizations is generally seen without effort, our Neolatin surnames being as a rule constructed on simple and fairly uniform lines; e.g.:

Latimer: Latimērus.
Selden: Seldenus.

Cheke: Checus.
Linacre: Linacrus.
Gray: Graius.
Sidney: Sidneius.
Gill: Gillius (so in Milton).
Jones: Ionesius (so in Milton).
Ussher: Usserius.

But Bale became 'Baleus,' Pace 'Paceus,' Price 'Pricaeus,' and Lowe (in Leland) 'Lovaeus.' Wolsey also was more often 'Wolsaeus' than 'Wolseius.'

The Latinized names in Bale's great series of English worthies are mostly of the above types—in marked contrast to those in Leland, who had a mania for the classical, forgetting that, if they were to be intelligible, the Latin names should not deviate too flagrantly from the vernaculars which they represented. Those in Polydore Vergil on the other hand are often singularly felicitous in their closeness to the native names, which is all the more surprising in one of foreign birth and education. The influence, however, of Italian habit is still discernible in some of his adaptations; he calls a Pole, of the family which produced Cardinal Pole, not 'Polus' but 'Pola'—in the same way as Dr John Dee became in Italian 'Dea[1].' The point is of some interest, since it explains the name of one of the four Oxford men who in the middle of the 15th cent. went off to perfect themselves in the New Learning in Italian schools. The received view, that he was in English John Free, is to my mind right and reasonable[2]. It is known that he remained several years in Italy; and in Italy his name would naturally be Italianized into 'Frea,' and from that Latinized into 'Frea' or 'Phreas.' Leland recognizes both forms; but 'Phreas' may very well have been preferred as more classical, the Greek termination making it so like such antique names as Aeneas and Boreas. I mention this, because

[1] See Dennistoun, *Dukes of Urbino* 3 p. 247. Dennistoun failed to see that the Englishman 'Dea' he mentions as visiting Urbino was no other than Dee, whose relations with Commandino are well known.

[2] This paper was already in proof when the *Oxford Deeds of Balliol College*, the new volume of the Oxford Hist. Soc., reached me. 'Johannes Free' appears there in a deed dated 1456.

it appears from a note in Sir J. E. Sandys' *History*, that another, and (to my thinking) most improbable explanation has been quite recently suggested to account for this name of 'Phreas.'

Although our English Latinized surnames are as a rule fairly intelligible, there are, it must be admitted, some the relation of which to the vernacular is far from obvious:—

Caius: Keyes.
Dunaeus: Downes.
Iacchaeus: Jack.
Junius: Young.
Rossus: Rowse (in Leland).
Vitus: White (of Basingstoke).

There was also a certain 'Volusenus' in literature, who is known to have been a Scotchman; but he kept the secret of his Scotch name so carefully that to this day no man can really say what it was.

Even such a brief and inadequate survey as this may suffice to show one thing, the large part accident and caprice have played for centuries in the Latinization of names. In the early days of the Renaissance, in writing to a friend, you might invent a Latin name for him, if he had not one already. 'Capnion' for Reuclin is said to have been the invention of Hermolaus Barbarus; and Erasmus addressed a Cambridge friend, Henry Bullock, as 'Bovillus'—regardless of the fact that there was a then living Frenchman, who was writing under that name. Then again, the name of the same man was not always a constant quantity; Casaubon was with some Hortibonus, with others Casaubonus, and with others Casaubo. So also when the same vernacular name was borne by several, the Latin for it was very far from being always the same; one Morel, for instance, was 'Morelius,' and another 'Morellus'; one Schryver, 'Grapheus,' and another 'Scriverius'; one Winter, 'Chimerinus,' and another (his contemporary) 'Guinterius.' And the exact converse of this is equally true—the same Latin word might do duty for very different vernacular surnames. 'Faber' might stand for Schmidt and Lefebvre; 'Junius' for Young, De Jonghe, and Du Jon; 'Palmerius' for Palmieri

and Le Paulmier; 'Olivarius' for Olivarez and Olivier; 'Foxius' for Fox and Du Foix; 'Puteanus' for Du Puy and De Put. The coincidence in these and similar instances is easily explained, as soon as one sees how learned names were constructed at different periods and in different countries.

The general conclusion—one so obvious that I hardly like putting it into words—is that one cannot be too cautious and circumspect in dealing with these learned names, and endeavouring to replace them by the supposed vernaculars. It is hazardous to assume that Arnaldus stood for 'Arnald,' or Holstenius for 'Holsten,' or Jordanus for 'Jordan,' or Mulinus for 'Mulin[1],' or Palmerius for 'Palmer'—though this sort of thing is sometimes done by editors and others, who ought to know better. And it is even more hazardous to retranslate a pseudonym by the discovery of some vernacular name that seems more or less like it in point of sense. In default of collateral evidence the identification is always a matter of conjecture.

I hope I may be permitted to add a concluding word or two as an expression of my own feeling—or prejudice, if any prefer that term—on the subject of these old Latinized surnames. It seems to me that the resuscitation of the vernacular names, real or supposed, of the scholars of past ages, is in a sense a distortion of history. The men themselves lived in a sort of Latin world; most of them habitually wrote in Latin, and for men who were always reading Latin; the names by which they were known in the great 'Republic of Letters' were either Latin or on Latin models, and these they have generally retained till quite recently. It is not the last word of wisdom to cast aside the older names in order to put in their place others, which some antiquary or archivist has been able to rescue from oblivion.

I. BYWATER.

[1] The real name of this Englishman was according to the *D. N. B.* Molyns or Molyneux. 'Mulin,' therefore, in Voigt[3] 2 p. 254 is a fiction. I may add that John Free remains 'Frea' in Voigt—through his too literal following of his Latin or Italian authorities.

THE DOOM OF THE ARGONAUTS. SENECA, MEDEA 607—669.

'Exigit poenas mare provocatum'; the sea, the element or its god Neptune, exacts penalties from the adventurers who dared to defy it in the first ship. This is the theme of a lyric of some length in the Medea of Seneca, sung by the chorus when trouble is impending for their leader, Jason. There are serious difficulties in the last two stanzas and to discuss them involves taking some survey of the whole piece. How would Seneca deal with the subject? Can we forecast or conjecture how he would proceed, from his procedure elsewhere and from that of other rhetorical poets of the silver age?

He would be concerned to illustrate his main point in the most picturesque and effective way, not greatly concerned about exactness in details or exact agreement with previous poets. He does in fact make mistakes about certain minor personages. Idmon (l. 652) was not killed by a serpent in Libya, but by a boar in Asia, *ἐπ' Ἀσίδος ἠπείροιο*, according to Apollonius (Arg. I, 444, II, 817 f.—'quamvis bene fata nosset' *is* in Apollonius, I, 140, *δεδαὼς τὸν ἑὸν μόρον*). It was Mopsus, not Idmon, who was killed by the Libyan serpent (Arg. IV). Further, Seneca has confused Mopsus *Τιταρήσιος* with another Mopsus, who was a Theban (655), son of Tiresias' daughter Manto. He has also confused the Argonaut Nauplius (*Δαναοῖο γενέθλη*, Arg. I, 133), who was an Argive, with the Euboean Nauplius who brought the Greek fleet to shipwreck in revenge for the death of his son Palamedes ('igne fallaci,' l. 658—'nociturus Argis' means destined to injure the fleet commanded by Agamemnon and partly belonging to Argos)

Secondly, he would not concern himself minutely with the question whether the disasters which overtook various heroes had actually happened by the time when the Corinthian chorus sings its song. Nor would he necessarily consider with care how the chorus came to know about them all. These questions would be more likely to occur to a later editor or diasceuast, and it is assumed by Leo and others that the plays were tampered with, or recast in some details, by such a person.

Some of the events, quite certainly, had already happened, e.g. the deaths of Tiphys, Idmon and Mopsus. The death of Nauplius, it is equally clear, was still in the future. Was the poet then limited to a choice between a past and a future tense? There was another tense, the Present, which he could use with a double justification.

There are numerous instances of what may be called the prophetic present:

χρόνῳ μὲν αἱρεῖ Πριάμου πόλιν ἅδε κέλευθος.

A thing decreed by fate is as good as accomplished already. And there was another Present, also of a rather subtle kind, seen in the lines (Aen. ii, 274):

quantum mutatus ab illo
Hectore, qui *redit* exuvias indutus Achillis,

and also in a Saturnian line of a Scipionic epitaph:

subigit omnem Lucanam obsidesque abdoucit.

The thing is put in the present because it is thought of not as a mere fact in time, but as a significant fact that is the measure of the hero's prowess. A fact which is significant or symbolizes something permanent is released from the fetters of chronology. It may denote a relationship, such as parentage

at Maiam...idem Atlas generat (Aen. viii, 140),
aut Tmaros aut Rhodope...edunt (Ecl. viii, 45),

or the source of a gift (Aen. ix, 264)

quem dat Sidonia Dido.

Such a present tense would be in place here, where the interest lies in the question *what* happened to the Argonauts, not *when* it happened.

One such present occurs beyond doubt in Seneca's lyric, ll. 644—5:

> fratrem, Meleagre, matris
> impius mactas.

Why should there not be another in 622—624?

> Aulis...retinet carinas
> stare gementes.

Editors, including Leo, have assumed that the Trojan expedition was already on foot, when Medea quarrelled with Jason at Corinth. It is possible. If we follow Apollonius, we may arrive at an interval of only five or six years between the return of the Argo and the gathering at Aulis. Achilles is an infant when the Argo sets sail (Arg. 1, 556). He was fetched from Scyros in the last year of the Trojan war, being then a youth of perhaps 18 years. So he would be eight when the Trojan war began. The Argonauts spent a long time in Lemnos and must have been some time in Colchis. An interval of five or six years seems to remain. But it may be doubted whether Seneca thought about this at all[1].

Seneca's *canticum* begins with seven Sapphic stanzas of the normal type, three lines followed by an Adonius. Then follow longer stanzas of eight lines each with an Adonius as the ninth. Five of these stanzas are complete and indubitable in text. Of the remaining lines the ninth is not an Adonius, though it

[1] I do not say that he did not. Leo finds a parallel in Thyest. 586:

> et putat mergi sua posse pauper
> regna *Laertes* Ithaca tremente.

It is another instance of 'sane quam putidum cacozeliae genus.' Thyestes, uncle of Agamemnon, has Laertes as a contemporary. The passage may be inept, but it is not clear that there is any special ineptitude in naming Laertes. If the poet at first thought of saying Ulysses, he would be at once arrested by the reflection that Ulysses belonged to the next generation.

contains the words 'crimine poenas' which make one. The text of these lines is as follows:

Idmonem, quamvis bene fata nosset,
condidit serpens Libycis harenis;
omnibus verax, sibi falsus uni,
concidit Mopsus caruitque Thebis.
ille si vere cecinit futura,
exul erravit Thetidis maritus;
igne fallaci nociturus Argis
Nauplius praeceps cadit in profundum,
patrioque pendet (pendit A) crimine poenas
fulmine et ponto moriens Oileus,
coniugis fatum redimens Pheraei
uxor, impendens (impendit A) animam marito.
ipse qui praedam spoliumque iussit
aureum prima revehi carina,
ustus accenso Pelias aeno
arsit angustas vagus inter undas.
iam satis, divi, mare vindicastis:
parcite iusso.

It is an obvious assumption, made both by Leo and Richter, and hardly to be disputed, that l. 660 should be read

.....patrioque pendet (or pendit)
crimine poenas,

so that half a line has been lost. But this gives us a stanza of *nine* Sapphic lines *plus* an Adonius. It is true that Seneca writes Sapphics in groups of varying length, e.g. in Oed. 110 f. we have stanzas in sequence of 13—8—11—9 lines. But that he should write a number of stanzas all of eight lines and then *one* of nine is hardly credible. Therefore there is a spurious line somewhere, which must be ejected. It has indeed been suggested (by v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff) that a whole stanza is lost and that ll. 660 and 661 are fragments of it. But in that case there would be eight stanzas in all, and the structure of the whole *canticum* is so regular as to afford a presumption that Seneca made the number of the longer stanzas the same as that of the short, namely seven.

There is no agreement about the line that is to be condemned. Leo ejected 657, exul erravit Thetidis maritus. Peiper keeps it, adopting Gruter's conjecture errabit (which is indeed necessary after 'ille si vere cecinit futura'). The current stories about Peleus rather suggest that he was an exile *before* the Argonautic expedition, but it is very doubtful whether Seneca would trouble himself about that. The case against the line is not conclusive. Peiper transposes lines, putting the two about Nauplius into the second stanza, and adopts a proposal of Richter's by which the two lines about Pelias are fused into one:

arsit accenso Pelias aeno.

But to do this is to remove what is precisely in Seneca's manner. Consider for example Herc. 616—617:

sed templa quare miles infestus tenet
limenque sacrum terror armorum obsidet?

Brevity is a quality of Seneca's style only in a certain sense. He does not say a thing diffusely, but he very often says it neatly twice. So here 'accenso aeno' and 'angustas inter undas' express the same thing, and Seneca wrote both. He also wrote 'vagus': Pelias was an adventurer in close-pent waters (not on the broad Euxine—the point is like that of 'fonte timendo' in l. 651).

Reverting to the question of tenses, I suggest that as Seneca wrote the passage it contained no futures. pendit in 660 was altered to pendet because the event had not happened at the time when the chorus sing[1]. And how did the chorus know that it was going to happen? A prophet must have foretold it. Why not Mopsus? 'ille si vere cecinit futura,' 656—*this* is the interpolated line. The writer of it did not stop to reflect that it was almost ludicrous to suggest a doubt about the truth

[1] It is strange, and contrary to the relation commonly supposed to exist between the two sources, that pendet should be in E (the codex Etruscus) and not in A (the 'recensio interpolata' from which the common MSS. are derived). But line 660 is the same in both; there was a perturbation or manipulation of the text which was antecedent to both and which therefore does not raise the question of their general relationship. The original reading might happen to survive in either.

of Mopsus' predictions when their veracity had just been condensed into an epigram 'omnibus verax, sibi falsus uni.' If his handling of the text had survived unimpaired, we should perhaps find that he preceded Gruter in altering erravit to errabit; or he may have thought of deleting that line, if he attended to the length of stanzas; or he appended his line as a mere suggestion or experiment, to show how the chorus' foreknowledge could be explained. The possibility is not excluded that Seneca himself appended it in that way.

Consider next the missing half-line. What editors have done so far has been to suggest words like 'occidet proles' or 'natus occumbet,' and to assume that Ajax could be called Oileus. Gronovius argued for it, but unconvincingly[1]. The editor of a recent school edition expressly says so, and also that Virgil had done it in Aen. i, 41 (unius ob noxam et furias Aiacis Oilei).

Virgil at all events did not do it. It is very doubtful whether it could be done. Ὀιλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας could not be called Oileus, any more than Achilles could be called Peleus or Heracles Amphitryon. 'Aiacis Oilei' is the genitive of 'Aiax Oilei,' not of 'Aiax Oileus,' as Conington and other editors have been aware.

It would not be legitimate to get rid of 'patrio crimine' by conjectural emendation and to suppose that Seneca is speaking of Oileus himself. That way is barred. There was *no* current or common tradition about the death of Oileus[2], and that Ajax perished 'fulmine et ponto' was one of the most familiar events in the whole story of Troy. It follows that Seneca must have written the vocative *Oileu*. So 'Meleagre' is vocative in 644, and possibly—but this requires investigation—'uxor' in 663. Can anything further be inferred? The whole story of Ajax

[1] His only relevant example is that Statius in Theb. ii, 473 called Pirithous by his father's name, Ixion. If Statius wrote 'Ixiona'—emendation is possible, but it is safer to suppose that he did—he must have meant that Ixion took part in the hunting of the boar. It is a strange lapse, for Pirithous was notoriously a contemporary of Theseus, another of the hunters; but it occurs in a simile, not in a deliberate narrative of the chase in Calydon.

[2] Valerius Flaccus thinks of Oileus as still living at the time when his son perished, *Argon.* i, 372–3.

was familiar, and one of the most conspicuous features of it was that there had been an offence *of his own*, punished by Minerva:

> ipsa Iovis rapidum iaculata e nubibus ignem
> disiecitque rates—

'fulmine et ponto'—*συνώμοσαν γὰρ ὄντες ἔχθιστοι τὸ πρὶν πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα.* Was the 'fulmen' for his own offence, the 'pontus' for his father's? Possibly. At all events everybody knew the story of Minerva's wrath, and Seneca himself relates it at length in the Agamemnon (528—566). Would he forget it here? If not, he may have written some such words as:

> *Tum suoque Aiax* or *cum suoque Aiax* patrioque pendit
> crimine poenas,
> fulmine et ponto moriens, Oileu.

The vocative *Oileu* would derive some slight help or support from a vocative 'uxor' in the lines about Admetus and Alcestis that follow:

> coniugis fatum redimens Pheraei
> uxor, impendens animam marito

(impendit, A, *impendes*, Peiper, Gronovium secutus). Leo retained both participles (the principal verb being *pendet poenas* in the preceding sentence). *impendit* looks like a surviving trace of the prophetic present, only the present tense is in the wrong place, where it is barred by metre. It is impossible to arrive at certainty: Seneca may have written either 'redimit' or with the vocative:

> coniugis fatum redimis Pheraei,
> uxor, impendens animam marito.

W. R. HARDIE.

NOTES ON MANIL. IV, 590 AND LUCR. V, 1009—1010.

Manilius, Astron. IV, 590:

> nascentem *ipsum*que diem mediosque calores
> teque, Helice.

E., W., S. and N.—a word is wanted to designate the West, with 'dies.' *lapsumque* has been suggested, and '*nascentemque imumque.*' But *lapsus dies* and *imus dies* are both very questionable expressions. Sen. Herc. 443, *quodcunque Titan ortus et labens videt* might be quoted for the former, but it does not prove that *lapsus dies* is really Latin.

If Manilius wrote *mersumque diem*, the *m* would run a risk of being annexed by the preceding word (nascentẽ), and the unintelligible *ersum* would be more likely to be turned into *ipsum* than the quite familiar *lapsum*. Claudian, De R. Proserp. I, 276, *merserat unda diem.*

Lucretius V, 1009—1010.

> illi imprudentes ipsi sibi saepe venenum
> vergebant, nunc dant sollertius ipsi.

If the words *nunc dant sollertius ipsi* are authentic—and there is nothing against them—the problem is to find a word of spondaic or anapaestic form which will account for *ipsi* and give with *ipsi* an intelligible sense. *Aliis*, an old conjecture, does not satisfy this condition. '*Nunc ipsi...*' belongs to an antithesis in which the persons have just been said to suffer something at the hands of others.

The only word I can discover that does satisfy the condition is *gnari—gnari ipsi*, themselves knowing that it is poison (while their victims do not), people who themselves know what they are giving.

gnari nunc dant sollertius ipsi.

W. R. HARDIE.

THE TRANSPADANI AND THE COLONY OF NOVUM COMUM.

In his last published work, *The Municipalities of the Roman Empire*, Prof. J. S. Reid speaks of Caesar having established a new Latin colony at Comum (p. 124). Neither for this, nor indeed for any other statement made in this valuable but very discursive book, is any reference or authority cited. It so happens however that this particular point was discussed by Prof. Reid in an interesting article contributed to the first number of the *Journal of Roman Studies* (pp. 69—77), entitled 'On some questions of Roman Public Law.' As I am unable to accept the conclusions deduced from the evidence in this discussion as either satisfactory or convincing, and as the question has some bearing on Caesar's policy and the methods of his opponents, I shall venture to subject the evidence to a re-handling.

It will be convenient to prefix to my discussion the principal passages from the ancient authorities which bear upon the subject.

(*a*) Asconius, *in Pison.* p. 3: 'Neque illud dici potest, sic eam coloniam (Placentiam) esse deductam quemadmodum post plures aetates Cn. Pompeius Strabo, pater Cn. Pompeii Magni, Transpadanas colonias deduxerit. Pompeius enim non novis colonis eas constituit sed veteribus incolis manentibus ius dedit Latii, ut possent habere ius quod ceterae Latinae coloniae, id est ut petendo magistratus civitatem Romanam adipiscerentur. Placentiam autem sex milia hominum novi coloni deducti sunt. ...Deducendi fuit causa ut opponerentur Gallis qui eam partem Italiae tenebant.'

(*b*) Suetonius, *Caes.* 8: 'Decedens ergo ante tempus colonias Latinas de petenda civitate agitantes adiit, et ad audendum aliquid concitasset, nisi consules conscriptas in Ciliciam legiones paulisper ob id ipsum retinuissent.' (67 B.C.)

(*c*) Sallust, *Cat.* 49: 'Nam uterque cum illo (Caesare) gravis inimicitias exercebant: Piso obpugnatus in iudicio pecuniarum repetundarum propter cuiusdam Transpadani supplicium iniustum, Catulus ex petitione pontificatus....' (Piso was one of the consuls mentioned in (*b*)).

(*d*) Dio Cassius, 37. 9: *ταῦτά τε ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἔτει συνέβη, καὶ οἱ τιμηταὶ περὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἠριδανὸν οἰκούντων διενεχθέντες, (τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἐς τὴν πολιτείαν αὐτοὺς ἐσάγειν ἐδόκει, τῷ δὲ οὔ) οὐδὲν οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἔπραξαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπεῖπον.* (65 B.C.)

(*e*) Caesar, *Bell. Civ.* 3. 87: 'Hae copiae, quas videtis, ex dilectibus horum annorum in citeriore Gallia sunt refectae, et plerique sunt ex coloniis Transpadanis.'

(*f*) Cicero, *ad Attic.* 5. 2. 3: 'Nondum enim satis huc erat adlatum quo modo Caesar ferret de auctoritate perscripta, eratque rumor de Transpadanis eos esse iussos IIIIviros creare.' (Written in May 51 B.C.)

(*g*) Cic. *ad famil.* 8. 1. 2: 'Ut nunc est, nulla magno opere expectatio est. Nam et illi rumores de comitiis Transpadanorum Cumarum tenus caluerunt, Romam cum venissem, ne tenuissimam quidem auditionem de ea re accepi.' (Written in the last half of May 51 B.C.)

(*h*) Strabo, p. 213: *αὕτη δ' ἦν μὲν κατοικία μετρία, Πομπήιος δὲ Στράβων ὁ Μάγνου πατὴρ κακωθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπερκειμένων Ῥαιτῶν συνῴκισεν· εἶτα Γάιος Σκιπίων τρισχιλίους προσέθηκεν· εἶτα ὁ θεὸς Καῖσαρ πεντακισχιλίους ἐπισυνῴκισεν, ὧν οἱ πεντακόσιοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὑπῆρξαν οἱ ἐπιφανέστατοι· τούτοις δὲ καὶ πολιτείαν ἔδωκε καὶ ἐνέγραψεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τοὺς συνοίκους· οὐ μέντοι ᾤκησαν αὐτόθι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὔνομά γε τῷ κτίσματι ἐκεῖνοι κατέλιπον· Νεοκωμῖται γὰρ ἐκλήθησαν ἅπαντες, τοῦτο δὲ μεθερμηνευθὲν Νοβουκῶμουμ λέγεται.*

(*i*) Cic. *ad famil.* 13. 35. 1: 'C. Avianius Philoxenus antiquus est hospes meus et praeter hospitium valde etiam

familiaris; quem Caesar meo beneficio in Novocomenses rettulit. Nomen autem Aviani secutus est quod homine nullo plus est usus quam Flacco Avianio.'

(*j*) Appian, *Bell. Civ.* 2. 26: *πόλιν δὲ Νεόκωμον ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐς Λατίου δίκαιον ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀλπέων ᾠκίκει, ὧν ὅσοι κατ' ἔτος ἦρχον ἐγίγνοντο Ῥωμαίων πολῖται, τόδε γὰρ ἰσχύει τὸ Λάτιον. τῶν οὖν Νεοκώμων τινά, ἄρχοντά τε αὐτοῖς γενόμενον καὶ παρὰ τοῦτο Ῥωμαῖον εἶναι νομιζόμενον ὁ Μάρκελλος ἐφ' ὕβρει τοῦ Καίσαρος ἔξηνε ῥάβδοις ἐφ' ὅτῳδη, οὐ πασχόντων τῶν Ῥωμαίων· καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἀνεκάλυπτε, τὰς πληγὰς εἶναι ξενίας σύμβολον καὶ φέρειν αὐτὰς ἐκέλευε καὶ δεικνύναι τῷ Καίσαρι.*

(*k*) Plutarch, *Caes.* 29: *Νεοκωμίτας γὰρ ἔναγχος ὑπὸ Καίσαρος ἐν Γαλατίᾳ κατῳκισμένους ἀφῃροῦντο [οἱ περὶ Μαρκελλον καὶ Λέντυλον] τῆς πολιτείας καὶ Μάρκελλος ὑπατεύων ἕνα τῶν ἐκεῖ βουλευτῶν ἐς Ῥώμην ἀφικόμενον ἥκιστο ῥάβδοις ἐπιλέγων ὡς ταῦτα τοῦ μὴ Ῥωμαῖον εἶναι παράσημα προστίθησιν αὐτῷ καὶ δεικνύειν Καίσαρι κελεύει.*

(*l*) Suetonius, *Caes.* 28: 'Nec contentus Marcellus provincias Caesari et privilegium eripere, rettulit etiam ut colonis, quos rogatione Vatinia Novum Comum deduxisset, civitas adimeretur, quod per ambitionem et ultra praescriptum data esset.'

(*m*) Cicero, *ad Attic.* 5. 11. 2: 'Marcellus foede in Comensi. Etsi ille magistratum non gesserat, erat tamen Transpadanus. Ita mihi videtur non minus stomachi nostro quam Caesari fecisse. Sed hoc ipse viderit.' (Written from Athens in July 51 B.C.)

Practically, almost all our knowledge of the constitutional status of Cisalpine Gaul is either contained in or inferred from the passage of Asconius (*a*). From the fact that he speaks only of the Transpadane region as affected by the lex Pompeia, it seems a fair inference that the country south of the Po, afterwards comprised in the province of Cisalpine Gaul, was allowed, either at once or eventually, to benefit by the provisions of the lex Iulia. Accordingly, it is universally assumed that such Latin colonies as Placentia and Bononia became colonies of Roman citizens, that the civitates foederatae were raised to the rank of Roman municipalities, and that the same may have

been true, as far as citizenship, if not complete municipal organisation, was concerned, of the fora, conciliabula and castella which had come into existence. That the Latin colonies of Cremona and Aquileia would be treated differently from all other Latin colonies, merely because they were north of the Po, it is impossible to believe, and their status too was no doubt settled by the lex Iulia, and they became Roman communities. It is in accordance with these assumptions that from this time forward the question of the civitas within the Italian peninsula only occurs in connexion with the Transpadani.

What was done with regard to the Transpadane region by Pompeius Strabo in 89 B.C. is clear from Asconius. The Italian municipal system was made general between the Po and the Alps, but in the form hitherto represented by the twelve later Latin colonies, of which Ariminum was the first and Aquileia the last. The towns within the whole region, many of them at any rate having hitherto been civitates foederatae, became in a loose sense of the term Latin colonies. They did not, with apparently at least one exception not noticed by Asconius, receive new citizens as colonists, but they had the status, privileges and constitution of towns with the jus Latii as conferred since 268 B.C. It is impossible to doubt that this constitutional settlement was accompanied by an elaborate redistribution of the country into large territoria belonging to these urban centres. The country was still however essentially Celtic, and round these towns, especially in the north, there must have been many native civitates or pagi. These Celtic civitates were, as we know from Pliny, 'attributae municipiis lege Pompeia.' The work indeed of Pompeius Strabo was, mutatis mutandis, very similar to that of his greater son in Pontus and Bithynia.

Most historians have followed Mommsen in dating the establishment of the Cisalpine province from the time of Sulla's dictatorship. This may be so, though I do not feel sure that the province was not established by the elder Pompey. But whether it was or not, the lex Pompeia was to all intents and purposes the lex provinciae for Gallia Cisalpina.

For the next 22 years we have, as far as I am aware, no

information about the Transpadane country, its provincial development or the feelings and aspirations of its inhabitants. If the motive for making the north of Italy into a province was more adequate protection against the Alpine tribes, we should expect it to be garrisoned, but there is no evidence that any governor had legions earlier than 59 B.C. In 67 B.C. however we get an important ray of light thrown by the statement of Suetonius (*b*). In that year the Latin colonies of the Transpadane district were 'de petenda civitate agitantes,' and in some way Caesar, who was returning from his quaestorship in Spain, associated himself with their demands. The version that he countenanced something like an armed rising may be classed with the story current about him and Crassus in connexion with the conspiracy of two years later, and was no doubt the invention of his political opponents at a later time. The important point is that the Transpadani had clearly put forward their demand before Caesar appeared on the scene, and that he supported it. Whether it was in connexion with the action of the consuls on this occasion, as alluded to by Suetonius, that C. Piso, who was one of them, inflicted the 'supplicium iniustum' on a Transpadane mentioned by Sallust is doubtful. At any rate a few years later Caesar again showed his championship of the Transpadani by making the act a serious count in Piso's trial for repetundae (*c*).

That the demand of the Transpadani for the Roman civitas was one of the acute questions of the day about this time is shown by the fact that it was at least one of the causes of such an estrangement between Crassus and Lutatius Catulus, the censors of 65 B.C., that they resigned office without completing the census. The words of Dio Cassius, quoted in (*d*), do not in my opinion bear out Mommsen's statement that 'Crassus as censor made arrangements to enrol the inhabitants directly in the burgess roll,...which was only frustrated by the resistance of his colleague' (*Rom. Hist.* Vol. IV. p. 158). It seems far more probable that some enfranchisement proposal *περὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἠριδανὸν οἰκούντων* was in the air during 65 B.C., and that Caesar and Crassus, certainly in close co-operation that year in connexion with Egypt, were known to view the scheme

favourably. If so, we can well understand that Catulus, the extreme optimate, might, as a protest, adopt mutatis mutandis the tactics of Bibulus in 59 B.C. and refuse to discharge the duties of his office. The fact that on the proposal of C. Papius all non-Italians were ejected from Rome at this time strongly points to some impending legislation in the comitia. *κἀν τούτῳ πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ διατρίβοντες πλὴν τῶν τὴν νῦν Ἰταλίαν οἰκούντων ἐξέπεσον, Γαΐου τινὸς Παππίου δημάρχου γνωμῇ* (Dio Cass. *loc. cit.*).

That a law so resolutely opposed by the conservative party at this time should have been staved off is not surprising when we remember the difficult position of the popular leaders during Pompey's command in the East. It is clear from the events of 63 B.C. that the Transpadani were in a dangerous frame of mind, and would not have hesitated to support a possible revolution, if by so doing they could secure the coveted civitas.

A more difficult question is raised, but not satisfactorily answered, by Prof. Reid in connexion with Caesar's consulship in 59 B.C. Why, when Caesar and Crassus, who had both pledged themselves on the question, were at one with Pompey, and in complete possession of the government, was there still no enfranchising law passed in favour of the Transpadani?

Prof. Reid thinks the answer not difficult. He finds it in the fact that, by giving all the inhabitants of the region full burgess rights, 'the provincial organisation of Gallia Cisalpina would not have been easy to maintain.' He adds that 'the position of the Cispadane region was already sufficiently anomalous, as was also that of the two or three towns to the North of the river, which had benefited by the lex Iulia' (p. 76).

In answer to the last point it may be asked, Why was the position of Cremona or Aquileia or Eporedia more anomalous in Cisalpine Gaul than that of the Roman colonies or municipia in such provinces as Narbonensis or Tarraconensis? But, apart from that, if the difficulty of maintaining the provincial organisation was so great an objection to the enfranchisement of the country in 59 B.C., how was it that neither Caesar nor Crassus realised the difficulty in 67 and 65 B.C.? The continued

interest of Caesar in the Transpadani can only have meant an interest in their enfranchisement. Besides, this particular difficulty existed as much in 49 as in 59 B.C., and yet it did not prevent Caesar from having the lex Roscia passed in the former year.

On the other hand, Mommsen would apparently explain the absence of legislation in 59 B.C. by supposing that Caesar regarded the Transpadani as already in some way legally entitled to the full civitas. This is the assumption underlying his interpretation of Crassus' action in 65 B.C. Caesar is represented during the whole of his 10 years' command as 'adhering to the stand-point of his party which, instead of seeking to procure for the Transpadani the Roman franchise, rather regarded it as already legally belonging to them' (*Rom. Hist.* IV. p. 312). What is thought to favour this view is the undoubted fact that Caesar freely recruited his legions from the Transpadane part of his province. He himself reports Labienus as saying of his army in Epirus: that it had been raised during recent years from levies in Cisalpine Gaul, and that most of the soldiers came from the Transpadane colonies (*e*). This however is by no means conclusive. While I should demur to Prof. Reid's assertion that Caesar allowed no precedent to stand in his way, there can be little doubt that in military matters he gave himself considerable latitude. The practice of admitting peregrini to the legions with the simultaneous conferment of the franchise was carried to excess during the civil wars, and was continued within limits under the Principate. It is probable that such enlistment could, perhaps with a little straining, be brought within the range of a governor's imperium, and that Caesar was the first to set an example of doing what was shamelessly abused by the Triumvirs. There was certainly a strong inducement for Caesar to do this, for the Transpadani were good material for soldiers, and had every reason to be loyal. It is possible, but not certain, that the Catonian party made this enlistment a charge against Caesar, and interpreted it as Mommsen does, but in the light of subsequent practice, such an interpretation seems to be uncalled for.

It seems indeed sufficiently clear that up to the spring of

51 B.C. nothing had taken place which implied with certainty any recognition of the Transpadani as Roman citizens. For it was in May of that year that Cicero in a letter to Atticus (*f*) alludes to a rumour current at the time to the effect that the Transpadane towns had been instructed by Caesar to elect IIIIviri. A remark in a letter of Coelius Rufus (*g*) makes it probable that the rumour was only local, and had no solid foundation in fact. The important point is that Cicero and his friends understood it to mean that Caesar was authorising the Transpadane towns to adopt the constitution of full Roman municipalities instead of that proper to Latin colonies[1]. He expected too some grave consequences from the act. But if Mommsen's theory is correct, that it had been all along the stand-point of the popular party to regard the Transpadani as already entitled to the full franchise, it is inconceivable that Caesar would have allowed eight years to pass before taking this step, while Cicero, long familiarised with the situation, could not, as he evidently did, have looked on the matter as a new danger.

But surely if the stand-point of the popular party was what Mommsen believes, there must have been some reason for it. The arrangements of the lex Pompeia seem to have been very definite, and there is no indication that its validity was ever questioned. The popular party, even under its most violent leaders, did not ignore existing laws, and carried out its own programme by means of legislation. It is not to be supposed that either Crassus or Caesar regarded the Transpadani as Roman citizens merely on grounds of abstract justice. There must have been some legal basis for their attitude. Mommsen passes over this difficulty, and there seems absolutely no evidence for any invalidation of the lex Pompeia between 89 and 67 B.C. It might be suggested that a law was passed during the Cinnan régime giving the Transpadani full citizen

[1] It cannot on the evidence be maintained that the magistrates in all Roman towns were IIIIviri, but there is no evidence, as far as I am aware, of any Latin town possessing these magistrates. The Atestan fragment of the lex Rubria proves that the towns of Gallia Cisalpina, affected by the lex Roscia, had IIviri prior to that law.

rights. But if so, and if Appian is correct in attributing to Sulla the announcement that he would not interfere with the status of any new citizens, why was this supposed law inoperative? Or, if Sulla cancelled it, and the Cinnan arrangement was not restored by the legislation of 70 B.C., as the incident of 67 B.C. shows could not have been the case, on what legal basis could the popular leaders rely?

Perhaps a more plausible suggestion would be that Sulla treated all these Transpadane towns as he treated Volaterrae and deprived them of the citizenship through the constitutive powers of the lex Valeria. But if the decision of the jurisconsults could set aside the legality of Sulla's action in the case of Volaterrae, can we imagine that the ambiguity with regard to the Transpadani would have been allowed to linger on for 20 or 30 years?

But for all these possibilities there is no evidence, whereas on the other hand we have the undisputed fact that the Roman civitas was actually conferred upon the Transpadani by the lex Roscia in March 49 B.C. There may be some difficulty in explaining why such a law was not passed ten years earlier, but at least it disposes equally of Mommsen's contention that the popular party all along regarded the Transpadani as legally entitled to the franchise, and of Prof. Reid's suggestion that the enfranchisement of the region was felt to be inconsistent with provincial organisation.

It is easier however to show that these two explanations of Caesar's abstention from legislation on the subject of the Transpadani in 59 B.C. are untenable than to suggest one more convincing. In all probability agitation for the franchise on the part of the Transpadani dated from the first establishment of the Cisalpine province, whenever that was. Differences of status within a province were not of course unusual, but where two definitely separated portions of a province were fully and partially privileged as the Cispadane and Transpadane regions were, the contrast was bound to lead to discontent in the latter. Sulla would no doubt ignore this discontent, and maintain the status quo of the lex Pompeia. The coalition of 70 B.C. evidently did the same, either because optimatist feeling was

already very strong on the subject, or conceivably because Pompey was reluctant to upset the arrangement made by his father. For some reason, which requires more explanation than the evidence affords, the conservative party looked with abhorrence on the desired enfranchisement. In no other way can we explain the impracticable resistance of Catulus in 65 B.C. or the passing of the lex Papia in the same year, or Cicero's fluster at the rumour about the IIIIviri, or the atrocious protest of Marcellus.

Caesar was of course strong enough in 59 B.C. to have enfranchised the country in spite of this optimatist feeling. But he was himself to be governor of Cisalpine Gaul for the next five years; he would have every opportunity of safeguarding the interests of the towns, and the confidence inspired by his position and his known sympathy would effectually stop the recent agitation in the country. He may even have thought that the Transpadani could be more depended upon while still expecting a favour than after receiving it. At any rate, there is sufficient evidence that Caesar, when he entered on his provincial command, was an avowed supporter of the claims of the Transpadani to receive full citizenship instead of the iūs Latii which the lex Pompeia had granted them.

It remains now to consider the narrower question with the statement of which I commenced this paper—Was Caesar's colony of Novum Comum merely a Latin colony, or was it invested with the full privileges of the Roman civitas? I think it may fairly be contended, apart from the evidence which will have to be examined in detail, that an antecedent presumption in favour of the latter view is furnished by the fact that up to the date of his consulship Caesar had identified himself with the discontent of the Transpadani at the possession of merely Latin rights. To establish or even to re-establish a colony with this inferior status would have seemed like acquiescing in the status quo, perpetuating a condition of things which the country repudiated, and positively reversing his previously announced policy. To abstain from immediately carrying out that policy was one thing, to act in direct contravention of it was quite another.

If the only evidence at our disposal was the statement that Caesar founded a colony at Comum, I imagine that the weight of this consideration would be admitted, and that few would doubt the Roman character of the settlement. But there is other evidence, and I am compelled to believe that it points to a conclusion opposite to that which Prof. Reid's handling of the passages in question suggests to him.

The few known and essential facts may be briefly stated. On taking possession of his province, Caesar settled 5000 colonists at Comum, henceforth often called Novum Comum (*h*). More strictly he settled 4500, since 500 of the number were Greeks of distinction, who were nominal and non-resident citizens of the colony. Caesar took this step, not 'on his own authority,' as many, incautiously following Mommsen, have stated, but on the empowering authorisation of a lex Vatinia passed in 59 B.C. (*l*). He may have acted without a colleague, but it is not necessary to assume this because no colleague's name is mentioned, any more than it is assumed in the case of Marius after the law of Saturninus. Eight years later Marcellus, consul in 51 B.C., had a citizen of Novum Comum scourged in Rome, an act which was in some way a manifesto against Caesar, and which raised the question of the status, whether Latin or Roman, of the colony. No solution of the problem can be satisfactory which does not give an intelligible explanation of this notorious outrage, testified to, as it is, by Cicero, Appian and Plutarch. The theory that Caesar gave his colony only Latin rights offers, as far as I can see, no explanation whatever.

The only direct statement that Novum Comum was a Latin colony is found in the words of Appian (*j*), that Caesar had colonised Novum Comum 'into the Latin right'—*ἐς Λατίου δίκαιον ᾠκίκει*. He goes on to explain correctly enough the relevant feature of the ius Latii, and then gives a manifestly erroneous version of the outrage, representing the victim to have been an ex-magistrate, and therefore a reputed Roman citizen, protected by law against scourging. He remarks however that the punishment was intended to be *ξενίας σύμβολον*, i.e. a mark of non-citizen status, without adding a word of

explanation as to the grounds of the disqualification implied in the act[1].

A close examination of the evidence will, I think, suggest that Appian only believed Novum Comum to be a Latin colony through a mistaken inference from his own erroneous version of the outrage. His version is of course an impossible one, for if the man had been a magistrate in a Latin colony, he would have been a Roman citizen, and neither Marcellus nor any one else would have dared openly and flagrantly to violate the lex Porcia.

Now in the first place, Appian's evidence is fatally vitiated at the outset by his ignorance of the fact that Comum had been a Latin colony long before the time of Caesar. He clearly regards Caesar's colonisation as equivalent to the conferment of Latin rights upon the town. The passages however, quoted from Asconius and Strabo (*a* and *h*), of course prove this to be a complete mistake. It appears from Strabo that in the case of Comum, Pompeius Strabo did not adopt the course, described by Asconius, of giving the place the rights of a Latin colony without planting new colonists there. On the contrary, for military purposes and as a protection against the Raeti, he made it a real and effective Latin colony on the model of Placentia or Aquileia. This exceptional treatment of Comum was of course due to its vulnerable situation, and it is impossible to doubt that the re-colonisations by Scipio and Caesar, where Strabo states the number of colonists, had the same military object.

Appian however is ignorant of all this. He knows that the colonist punished by Marcellus had some claim to be a Roman citizen, that the claim was disallowed, and that the disallowance was ἐφ' ὕβρει τοῦ Καίσαρος, i.e. in defiance of his colonisation.

[1] Prof. Reid identifies ξενίας σύμβολον with 'tessera hospitalis.' Perhaps he is right, but the joke is somewhat elephantine, and apparently Plutarch did not see it, if indeed it is not Appian's *bon mot* rather than that of Marcellus. Apart from the possible *double entendre*, the phrase clearly means 'a mark of non-citizen status,' and is in any case neater, if less precise, than Plutarch's τοῦ μὴ Ῥωμαῖον εἶναι παράσημα. A tessera hospitalis could of course be given to Romans or non-Romans, but the recipient was never an actual citizen of the community conferring the hospitium.

He had also clearly found in his authorities some reference to the question whether or not a magistracy had been held. From these data it was fairly obvious to infer, (1) that the claim to citizenship was based on the tenure of a magistracy, and (2) the man being nevertheless scourged, that the Latinitas of the town was impugned, and (3) as it was Caesar's act which was impugned, that that act must have been the bestowal of Latin rights. But if Appian had known, as we do, that the man had not held a magistracy—that Comum had been a Latin colony for 30 years, he would perhaps have given more reliable information. The one point which his evidence seems to me to establish is that the person scourged claimed by virtue of some act of Caesar to be a Roman citizen.

From the passage of Strabo we get, if I mistake not, more positive indications that Caesar established a Roman and not a Latin colony. Strabo was himself perhaps, as Prof. Reid suggests, not interested in the distinction. He describes in precisely the same way the settlements of Pompey, Scipio and Caesar, and we might imagine that they only differed from one another in respect of the number of colonists. From one point of view the three acts of colonisation did fall under the same category. Comum was peculiarly exposed to the incursions of the Raetian barbarians, and it was to protect this vulnerable point that Caesar, like the other two, planted colonists there. It was not therefore a step towards the enfranchisement of the Transpadani. He would hardly have begun such enfranchisement at so out-of-the-way a spot. The colony had a purely military object, and there is no evidence that the validity of the colony or of the franchise involved in it was questioned, until the Catonian party took up a position of open hostility to Caesar after Pompey's third consulship in 52 B.C.

With regard to the status of Caesar's colonists, Strabo tells us nothing directly. There is no indication whatever as to the class from which 4500 of them were drawn. The interest and importance of the passage lies in the statement about the 500 illustrious Greeks whom Caesar made nominal citizens of the colony. I am compelled to differ entirely from Prof. Reid in his treatment of these 500 Greeks. He supposes that

Caesar was empowered by the lex Vatinia to settle Latin colonists, of course a fixed number, at Comum, and at the same time to grant the Roman citizenship to a prescribed number of 'aliens,' who were to be non-resident citizens of the colony. He also suggests that Caesar would have taken these 'aliens' from the Transpadani, if he had felt himself able to do so. This suggestion seems wholly gratuitous and improbable, but it does not affect the main question.

I believe with Prof. Reid that the clause in the lex Vatinia concerning the incorporation of 'aliens' has a precedent in the colonial law of Saturninus, in which Marius was empowered to incorporate 300 Italians in each colony founded by him[1]. I am not sure however that there is any justification for saying that 'this was a regular practice when the older burgess colonies were founded.' At any rate, and this is the relevant point, it was not the regular practice, and was quite inconsistent with the regular practice, when Latin colonies were founded. As Prof. Reid himself admits, Roman citizens who joined a Latin colony, themselves became Latins. It seems to me an entire misconception to suppose that the permission granted by the lex Apuleia or the lex Vatinia or by any other colonial law was first to create a certain number of Roman citizens, and then to incorporate them in this or that colony. It was rather a permission to incorporate certain peregrini in a Roman colony, provided for by the law, whereby they ipso facto became Roman citizens, like the other colonists. This was the indirect way in which Saturninus would have brought about the enfranchisement of a good many Italians. Appian alludes to this in his somewhat obscure phrase, πλεονεκτούντων ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῶν Ἰταλιωτῶν (1. 29). This too was probably what C. Gracchus did, when, with or without legal permission, he tried to make up the number of colonists for Iunonia ἐξ ὅλης Ἰταλίας.

This, it seems to me, is what Caesar did in the matter of the 500 Greeks. I agree that Cicero's reference to one of their number, C. Avianius Philoxenus, 'quem Caesar...in Novocomenses rettulit' (*i*), makes it pretty certain that they

[1] Surely Ihne must be right in reading 'trecenos' for 'ternos' in *pro Balbo*, 49.

became Roman citizens, but I entirely dissent from Prof. Reid's contention that Strabo's words imply any difference of civic status between them and the other colonists or that he even directly states them to have been Roman citizens at all. He says indeed that they were more distinguished persons than the rest, and they were no doubt not mere soldiers, but men of learning or reputation or social rank in their own country. Beyond this, he only says that Caesar gave them citizenship in the colony, and enrolled their names in the colonial register. Prof. Reid takes the words ἔδωκε πολιτείαν to mean that he gave them the Roman citizenship. I imagine that few will agree with him. Even if Strabo had written τὴν πολιτείαν, the context would have been against this interpretation, but the absence of the article surely makes it impossible. Presumably, if he had so desired, Caesar, with the strength of the coalition at his back, could have had a law passed authorising the full enfranchisement of the 500 Greeks, and, if he had done this, he might perhaps have attached his new citizens to one of the urban tribes in Rome. But the fact that permission to create Roman citizens was contained in what is admitted to have been a colonial law, is, I venture to maintain, a conclusive proof that the citizenship was the result of incorporation in a colony, and that the colony must therefore have been a Roman colony.

This conclusion is quite independent of the answer to Prof. Reid's question, 'Was it possible to create a new colony in which the colonists had not all the same legal status?' At the same time, I believe that the answer must be in the negative. At least, no one of the instances adduced justifies an affirmative answer. It is of course true that in every Latin town, while most of the citizens had Latin rights, there was always a minority of Roman citizens, who had gained the civitas through a magistracy. But this was obviously not a case of creating a new colony of composite status. It was an inevitable anomaly, arising out of the very nature of Latinitas, regulated and mitigated by the lex data, but never probably without its drawbacks and inconveniences. Still, every Latin colony, though not at its creation, yet in its development, was a

composite community. The fact however that resident Roman citizens, belonging to some other community, had a restricted vote at elections is surely irrelevant, since the presence and voting of such incolae no more made the state a composite one than the presence and voting of Latins did in the comitia at Rome.

The citation from Livy, 34. 42, is more to the point, though there was no new restriction placed upon Latins at that date, 193 B.C., but a new privilege then claimed by Latins and refused. 'Novum ius eo anno a Ferenatibus tentatum est, ut Latini qui in coloniam Romanam nomina dedissent cives Romani essent.' Some Latins had been accepted as colonists for Puteoli and other places, and in accordance with this new claim, gave themselves out as Roman citizens, but 'senatus iudicavit non esse eos cives Romanos.' It is not clear however that this 'adscription' of Latins made the colony a composite one. More probably the Latins who joined it were constitutionally in the position of incolae. At any rate, the obvious inference from the story seems to be this, that if Latins did not become Roman citizens by joining a Roman colony, still less would Greeks become Roman citizens by joining a Latin colony.

I should myself be inclined to apply a somewhat similar explanation to the case of the Salassi at Augusta Praetoria, 'qui se initio in coloniam contulerunt.' I agree with Prof. Reid that it is impossible to regard them as full citizens of the colony. I agree also that they probably received Latinitas, but it does not follow that they formed a class of inferior citizens in a composite community. There can be little doubt that they were 'attributed' to the colony with Latin rights, as the Carni and Catali were 'attributed' by Augustus to Tergeste, as some of the Anauni were 'attributed' to Tridentum, and as many other Gallic civitates had been 'attributed' to municipia by the lex Pompeia. Why Caesar in founding a military colony chose to add to it these nominal and non-resident citizens, is a question which cannot be answered. We know that, as dictator, he gave the citizenship to many Greek professors of the liberal arts, and it may have been the same feeling and motive which

actuated him in 59 B.C. Or they may have been persons with whom Pompey had come in contact during his command in the East, and whom he was anxious to oblige. That Pompey had some special interest in the colony, we shall see when we consider our last passage from Cicero. It is certain that Cicero, and probable that Roman society in general, found no fault with the enfranchisement of these Greeks at the time, and it is unlikely that the objections afterwards made to Caesar's carrying out of the lex Vatinia, as being 'per ambitionem et ultra praescriptum,' had any special reference to these Greeks. The passages from Plutarch and Suetonius (*k* and *l*) contain nothing inconsistent with one another, and, taken together, give an intelligible account of the whole story, though without any mention of the 500 Greeks. They are strongly in favour of the view that Novum Comum was a Roman colony, and Prof. Reid's manipulation of them to get the opposite conclusion will not bear a close examination.

We learn from Suetonius that in 59 B.C. Caesar had planted colonists at the place on the authority of a lex Vatinia. It was the same year in which his lex agraria was carried, by which he was empowered to establish colonies in Italy, both on the ager Campanus and on purchased land in other parts. For any extra-Italian colony he would need the authorisation of a special law, precisely as C. Gracchus had needed the lex Rubria as a preliminary to his colonial scheme of founding Iunonia. I have already expressed the opinion, which indeed is a necessary inference from Strabo, that the colony was intended by Caesar as a 'propugnaculum imperii,' just as Eporedia was by Marius. Strabo does not tell us, and Prof. Reid makes no suggestion on the point, from what class or classes of men the 4500 effective colonists were drawn. They were very likely not all from the same class. I should conjecture that many of them may have been Pompeian veterans, for whom provision was certainly being made at the time. But it is not impossible that Transpadani, many or few, were included in the number. They were the men from whom Caesar chose to recruit his legions, and he may well have deemed them suited to the work required from the colony. There would have been no difficulty in getting the

necessary permission to incorporate them, and it is in no way necessary to assume that 500 was the maximum number of those who might by the terms of the law receive the franchise on enrolment in the colony.

There is no indication that any objection was raised to any part of this colonial scheme either at the time or during the next eight years. Suetonius, Plutarch and Cicero all agree that hostile action in the matter on the part of the optimates was taken in 51 B.C.[1]

Suetonius states that Marcellus took away the citizenship from the colonists whom Caesar had planted (deduxerat) at Novum Comum. Plutarch makes precisely the same statement. It is curious that Prof. Reid seems to accept the statement when made by Suetonius, because he somehow finds in it a confirmation of 'the impression that Caesar's colonists at Novum Comum had not all the same legal status,' but rejects it when made by Plutarch, because 'it indicates that he did not altogether understand the circumstances,' the misunderstanding being that Plutarch believed it to be a Roman colony, whereas his critic has decided otherwise.

Suetonius proceeds to give the reason for the action of Marcellus, viz. that the citizenship had been given 'per ambitionem et ultra praescriptum.' Now it is obvious that these are manufactured reasons, invented eight years after the colony had been founded when a dead-set was being made against Caesar's particular acts and general position. It was within a very short time of the probably unfounded rumour that he had ordered the Transpadane towns to elect IIIIviri. The conservative party was encouraged by the anti-Caesarian symptoms in Pompey's sole consulship. It was also probably nervous and anxious as to Caesar's possible intentions. The report 'de comitiis Transpadanorum' (*g*) had evidently for the

[1] Plutarch, it is true, makes the perhaps pardonable mistake of confusing the three Marcelli, who were consuls in successive years (51 to 49 B.C.), and makes Lentulus Crus instead of Sulpicius Rufus the colleague of the Marcellus who took the leading part in what followed. It is not however a real mistake as to date, since Curio is spoken of as not yet tribune, and the slip does not in the least invalidate Plutarch's evidence on the main points.

moment made a deep impression. Caesar was credited with the absurd design of carrying out now by a *coup de main* what he could easily have accomplished years ago by legislation. In this tension of feeling sinister motives were readily discerned in an act long past, and hitherto regarded as unobjectionable. The colonisation of Comum was now represented as a bid for popularity among the Transpadani (per ambitionem). It was easy too to discover irregularities in its accomplishment. The words 'ultra praescriptum' are vague, and need not imply that the number of colonists fixed by the law had been exceeded. This however may well have been the case. Caesar would probably in choosing his 500 Greeks or his 4500 military colonists not have been more careful not to exceed the legal number than C. Gracchus had shown himself in collecting colonists for Iunonia. If Caesar had allowed himself any laxity in this respect, we may be sure that Catonian precisionists would have been only too ready to declare the whole law invalid. This indeed, whatever the irregularity may have been, was probably the course adopted. It was clearly a theory among the constitutionalists that many of the laws both of Caesar and Vatinius passed in 59 B.C. were strictly null and void, as having been carried by force, or against the auspices, or in defiance of intercessio. Cicero, most unhappily for his own reputation, had ventured to act on this theory in 56 B.C. in connexion with the lex Iulia agraria, and it is quite likely that Marcellus and his Catonian friends took a similar course in 51 B.C. If so, it would mean the taking away of the Roman citizenship from all on whom it had been newly conferred, and in effect the degradation of the town to the rank of a Latin colony. This would even, I conceive, involve for any Pompeian veterans who might have been settled at Comum, except in the case of those who had held a magistracy, the loss of Roman citizenship, since by a rigid application of the old rule, they would be regarded and treated as Romans who had joined a Latin colony.

From the point of view therefore of Marcellus and the senatorial party Comum was again a Latin colony. It followed that those only of its citizens, whether old or recent, were

Roman citizens who had held a magistracy. I cannot understand in what way the words of Suetonius imply a distinction of status among the colonists. There is nothing whatever to indicate that 'ultra praescriptum' refers only or specially to the 500 Greeks, or that the citizenship was only taken away from these. On the contrary, it was taken away from the colonists whom Caesar had planted at Comum, and the word 'deduxerat' is not applicable to these non-residents. It would be most arbitrary to maintain that Suetonius is referring to one class of colonists who lost the civitas, and Plutarch to another, and the latter is beyond doubt referring to resident colonists, since the senator who was scourged was one of them.

There is indeed no part of Prof. Reid's argument which is less convincing than his treatment of Plutarch's evidence. Plutarch begins by stating explicitly that Marcellus and his friends deprived of the citizenship those who had been settled as colonists at Novum Comum by Caesar. One of these, a senator of the colony, who happened to be in Rome, Marcellus caused to be scourged, as a practical indication that he was not a Roman citizen. The act was obviously perpetrated to prove in this brutal way that the disenfranchisement was real and effective. On this Prof. Reid remarks, 'whereas Appian blundered in making the man a past magistrate and therefore a Roman, Plutarch presents him as only a member of the local senate, and no Roman. Therefore in Plutarch's view Novum Comum does not possess citizen rights.' Surely this is to argue in a circle. If Plutarch includes this senator, as he certainly does, among those deprived of the citizenship, he must, I presume, have regarded him as possessed of the citizenship up to the act of deprivation. After that act, Plutarch expresses no opinion of his own as to the man's status, but says that Marcellus scourged him to show that in his view he was no Roman[1]. Plutarch is clear, precise and consistent, and the only conclusion

[1] Plutarch's statement that the man was a senator is not of course in itself inconsistent with that of Appian that he was a past magistrate. The senatorial album of Canusium shows that in that town as many as 68 out of the 100 decuriones were ex-magistrates. If Plutarch considered

to be drawn from his statement is that Novum Comum was a colony of Roman citizens. To assert that the statement as to the citizenship being taken away is a misunderstanding of the circumstances is simply to beg the whole question.

Suetonius and Plutarch therefore are in perfect agreement on the essential point. The citizenship which both represent as taken away from the colonists was the Roman citizenship, and the particular colonist, scourged by Marcellus, claimed to be a Roman citizen, not, as Appian erroneously supposed, on the tenure of a magistracy in a Latin colony, but on belonging to a military burgess colony. From Plutarch and Suetonius together we can gather an intelligible story, and the only story which gives an intelligible sense to the last passage from Cicero (*m*).

Prof. Reid asserts that 'this passage is unintelligible unless Novum Comum was a Latin colony. The reference to a magistracy would be meaningless.' I venture to think on the other hand that the passage is unintelligible on the supposition that Novum Comum was established as a Latin colony by Caesar. For in that case there would have been no motive for the outrageous action of Marcellus. The colonists of Comum would have been in the same legal position as all the other Transpadani, a position thoroughly acquiesced in by the constitutional party since the lex Pompeia. Any Transpadani included by Caesar among the 4500 colonists would have had no better civic status than they had before, and there was no possible motive for outraging a Transpadane as such. Prof. Reid himself suggests no motive, though, I suppose, he would contend that any insult to a Transpadane was an insult to Caesar. Such a pointless insult however is not what we should expect from a party engaged at this very time in employing such elaborate constitutional contrivances against Caesar.

Comum a Roman town, there would be no occasion to allude to a magistracy, whether held or not held by the man. We know from Cicero's words that he had not held one. Besides, if he had, Marcellus, acting as he was on the theory that Comum was a Latin colony, could not possibly have disputed his Roman citizenship.

To make the story intelligible, some definite motive is required, which the theory of Comum being only a Latin colony does not afford. This motive is supplied by both Appian and Plutarch. They both distinctly bring the insult to Caesar into connexion with his colonisation of Comum. They both represent the man scourged as claiming to be a Roman citizen, and Marcellus as disallowing that claim. Appian wrongly supposes that the claim was merely based upon the tenure of a magistracy. Plutarch is aware that the man possessed the civitas in common with the other colonists. But they both assert in almost identical terms that the scourging was intended to signify that the claim to Roman status was disallowed. Why it was disallowed, Suetonius, as we have seen, tells us vaguely and imperfectly, but in a way which admits of intelligible explanation. Whatever was the precise form in which the deprivation of citizenship took place, and it was probably by a declaration of the senate that the lex Vatinia was invalid, the result was that, from the stand-point of Marcellus and his friends, Comum was merely the Latin colony it had been between 89 and 59 B.C. The question of the magistracy therefore was from this point of view all important. I am not sure, in spite of Cicero's epithets, that Marcellus was 'by no means a violent man,' but in any case he would never have ventured to scourge an acknowledged Roman citizen. He had to make quite sure, and from Cicero's words he had made quite sure, that the man, though possibly a senator, had not been a magistrate. If Prof. Reid had contented himself with saying that Cicero's reference to a magistracy was meaningless unless Marcellus regarded Comum as a Latin colony, the remark would have been unexceptionable. But the attitude of Marcellus was one thing, the status actually given to the colony by Caesar and the lex Vatinia was quite another.

Cicero severely condemns the action of Marcellus, not as illegal, for he no doubt accepted as valid the disenfranchisement of the colony, but as an outrage on humanity and as inconsistent with political expediency. Legally, it is probable that Latins, in spite of the proposal or law of the elder Livius Drusus, were liable to be scourged. But every year crowds of Latins by

virtue of their Latinitas were becoming Romans as it were automatically, and it was obviously monstrous to subject to such an indignity a man whom perhaps a year's magistracy alone separated from the citizenship. But the words 'erat tamen Transpadanus' were far more a protest against a political blunder. The Transpadani had long been a factor in Roman politics which could not be ignored. So far their demand for complete enfranchisement, which for some not very intelligible reason appeared intolerable to the conservatives, had been staved off. But such a practical exhibition of the disabilities involved in Latinitas would not only increase tenfold the devotion of the Transpadani to their champion, Caesar, but would make it impossible any longer for Caesar to postpone the grant of the franchise which would render such outrages impossible in future. The lex Roscia, passed in the very first months of the civil war, was Caesar's answer to this silly defiance of Marcellus.

Cicero's concluding words suggest that Pompey would be hardly better pleased with what had taken place than Caesar himself. This has usually been explained by the fact that the settlement of the Transpadane region had been the work of Pompey's father, and that he therefore took a special interest in these Latin communities. The suggestion is perhaps a little far-fetched, and there is at any rate no evidence that Pompey, like Caesar and even Crassus, had concerned himself about the Transpadani in the interval. It is possible that Pompeius Strabo may have settled in his colony at Comum some of the soldiers who had served under him in the Social war, and that on that account Pompey had a special interest in that particular town. I imagine that, when Caesar established his settlement at Comum with Roman rights, the act would carry with it the enfranchisement of any remaining colonists planted there by Pompey or Scipio. This of course was not absolutely necessary, but as in all the older colonies the assimilation between the settlers and the older inhabitants had long since been complete, Caesar, especially with his liberal views, would naturally have taken this course. I cannot believe that he would have tolerated any distinction between Comenses and Novocomenses,

and I understand this to be Strabo's meaning, when he says, Νεοκωμῖται γὰρ ἐκλήθησαν ἅπαντες. In this way it is not impossible that the victim of Marcellus was a son or grandson of one of the original Pompeian settlers. But there remains the possibility that mutatis mutandis there was as close a connexion between the lex Vatinia and Caesar's agrarian laws as there was between the lex Rubria and the colonial scheme of C. Gracchus. In that case many if not most of the actual colonists may have been chosen from among Pompey's veterans for whom Caesar was certainly providing at the time. Marcellus in his desire to insult Caesar may have overlooked the slight to Pompey, or he may even have disregarded it, as it is clear from both Cicero and Plutarch that Pompey was at the time opposing him on the question of appointing a successor to Caesar. 'M. Marcello consuli finienti provincias Gallias Kalendarum Martiarum die restitit.' One or other of these possibilities[1] would, I think, give more point to Cicero's words, 'videtur non minus stomachi nostro quam Caesari fecisse' than the usual explanation.

What is especially interesting about the question both as to the status of Comum and the treatment of its nameless citizen is that we happen to have so many statements bearing upon it, no one of which by itself is free from obscurities, but which, pieced and compared together, give us a fairly clear and consistent account of the whole episode. Caesar's colonisation of Comum was not a purposeless act, taken on his own authority and in defiance of the senate, it was not a partial and indirect method of redeeming a pledge of enfranchisement to the Transpadani, which he was not strong enough to carry through directly. The number of new citizens created under the terms of the lex Vatinia was not a mere instance of the megalomania of the times. The step was one of a series of military precautions to protect a vulnerable point, no doubt all the more

[1] While there were very likely Pompeian veterans among the Novocomenses, the statement of Suetonius that the civitas was 'given' to colonists settled there makes it practically certain that Transpadani were also included. On the whole, Cicero's marked use of the word 'Transpadanus' points to the man who was scourged being one of these.

necessary at the moment in view of the disquieting rumours as to the intended movements of the Helvetii. What made it differ from the two previous acts of colonisation was, partly the political agitation in the Transpadane region, which Caesar had favoured, and which prevented him from perpetuating the present state of things by founding a colony with merely Latin rights, partly perhaps the inclusion in the colony of Pompeian veterans, who could not be expected to accept the status of Latins. Caesar therefore made the town a burgess colony. The fact that, while the colony was established in 59 B.C., the protest against the citizenship of its members was not made till 51 B.C., shows conclusively that the objections urged by Marcellus and stated by Suetonius were an afterthought, got up at a time when Caesar's whole position was being attacked. Nevertheless, it was easy for the constitutional party, when startled by silly rumours as to Caesar's intentions, to find technical flaws either in the passing or carrying out of the lex Vatinia, and Marcellus was better supported in getting it invalidated than Cicero had been in a similar attempt in 56 B.C. His success meant, as Plutarch and Suetonius put it, that the Novocomenses were deprived of the Roman citizenship. Then followed the fortunate or unfortunate appearance in Rome of the Senator from Comum, and the scourging as a *ξενίας σύμβολον*. The affair was perhaps crowded out of attention by more exciting events, but it was undoubtedly the cause of the rapid enactment of the lex Roscia almost within a month of Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon.

E. G. HARDY.

THE ΣΥΡΙΓΞ TECHNOPAEGNIUM.

The technopaegnium entitled Σῦριγξ is ascribed to Theocritus by the *lemma* attached to it in the Palatine Anthology[1] and it occurs in several manuscripts of the poet's works. The attribution has not indeed passed without question, since many editors in the past have either excluded the poem from their texts of Theocritus or marked it as spurious; at present, however, there is a marked tendency to reinstate it. It has been defended by Bergk[2], Haeberlin[3], and Wilamowitz[4], and is accepted by Reitzenstein[5], Wendel[6], Legrand[7] and Croiset[8]: Hiller, once sceptical, has been persuaded[9], and Susemihl[10] goes so far as to say: 'von Unechtheit dieses kleinen Gedichts kann nicht mehr die Rede sein.'

In one respect these scholars are quite justified in their attitude towards the poem, for the evidence hitherto adduced against it cannot be regarded as satisfactory. Indeed little has been said against it, except that it is *geschmacklos*[11], and certainly no aesthetic judgment as to the merits of the piece can be allowed as evidence that it is not by Theocritus. On

[1] xv. 21.

[2] *Anth. Lyr.* ed. min. 1868, p. lxviii.

[3] *Carmina Figurata*, p. 40.

[4] *Textgesch. d. Griech. Bukol.* p. 247.

[5] *Epigram u. Skolion*, p. 225.

[6] *Nomina Bucolica*, p. 15.

[7] *Étude sur T.* p. 22.

[8] *Lit. Grec.* v. p. 183.

[9] *Theokrits Gedichte* (Fritzsche ed. 3), p. 296; *Jahresbericht* liv. p. 200.

[10] *Griech. Lit. in d. Alexandrinerzeit*, i. p. 200.

[11] Hiller (*op. cit.* p. 296) once thought the reminiscences of the *Idylls* in the poem suspicious, but they do not, I think, warrant more than a suspicion. Fritzsche thought that the number of reeds in the pipe (ten) was sufficient to condemn it. This is not the case: see below.

this ground, neither the form of the poem nor its subject-matter can be used to dispute its authenticity. Simias had written *carmina figurata* before the time of Theocritus and, as to the pedantic obscurity of allusion, errors of taste, especially errors of this kind, are common among Theocritus's literary contemporaries, nor is Theocritus himself wholly guiltless. Since moreover the whole aim and object of the poem is to be as pedantic and obscure as possible, the lack of taste lies not in the execution but in the conception of the jest, and it would be difficult indeed to show that Theocritus could not have joked in this way.

The question is not, it may be said, of much importance; but few admirers of Theocritus can be pleased to find this tedious piece among his writings, and the poem, if authentic, has a bearing of some little moment upon the interpretation of the *Idylls*. The 'Mascarade Bucolique,' which is now detected by all editors in the seventh Idyll, and by most editors in other places also, depends ultimately on the assumption that Simichidas in *Id.* vii. is Theocritus himself. This identification would be certain if Theocritus referred to himself elsewhere under this name, and, if the *Syrinx* be genuine, he does so there. On the other hand, the belief of some other person that Simichidas is Theocritus adds little or nothing to the evidence supplied by the seventh Idyll itself, since, *prima facie*, one who speaks in the first person is the poet, and the author of the *Syrinx*, no less than modern editors, may be mistaken in his inference[1]. To the 'Mascarade Bucolique' I may return on some future occasion; in the present paper I propose to review the evidence for the authorship of the *Syrinx* and I shall endeavour to show that the received ascription to Theocritus is untenable. I begin with the arguments for the authenticity of the poem produced by Bergk.

[1] The inference was made both by the author of the barbarous verses which begin Σιμιχίδα Θεόκριτε σοφῶν ὁίων ποιμάντωρ and are affixed to the *Idylls* in four manuscripts, and presumably also by the authorities (mentioned by Suidas) who asserted that Theocritus's father was named not Praxagoras but Simichus.

Bergk complains, truly, that no reasons have ever been adduced to prove the poem spurious, and he gives three arguments in favour of supposing it genuine: first, that the subject is one which might well have been treated by a bucolic poet; secondly, that the poem is ascribed to Theocritus both by MSS. and scholia; and, thirdly, that the poem itself claims to be by him. Of these three arguments, the first two are largely dependent upon the third. The poem certainly claims to be by Theocritus, and the claim is at least *prima facie* evidence that it is his work. When we have admitted this, however, the remainder of Bergk's plea has little independent value. In the first place, the claim made in the poem may account quite sufficiently for the ascription of it to Theocritus, and in the second, supposing the work spurious, it would indeed be remarkable if the author of a poem which claims to be by Theocritus, or is put into his mouth, had not been at pains to select a subject which might without impropriety be so attributed. Whether the case were one of deliberate forgery, or rather of a mere *jeu d'esprit*, the selection of a suitable subject would be an essential of success.

Thus the ascription of the poem to Theocritus seems, so far as Bergk's evidence goes, to rest almost entirely on the evidence of the work itself. It would be the most natural thing in the world for a poem which claims, as this poem claims, to be by a well known author, ultimately to find its way into that author's works, and to be recognised as his. Indeed, it may be confidently asserted that the only circumstance which could have kept it out of the list of Theocritus's works would have been a firm tradition of the name of the real author. But if the poem was a conscious imposture, this name would *ex hypothesi* never be attached to it, and even if the author had no intention of deceiving, his name would run every risk of being replaced by that of the poet on whom he had fathered his work. In such circumstances, where error is so likely, we can hardly venture to attach importance to the ascriptions either of the manuscripts or of the scholia. Nor indeed can much reliance be placed upon the statement contained in the poem itself. Forgery was common enough in

the Alexandrian age and after, nor can it be maintained that the production of such a work as a mere literary exercise with no intention to deceive was unlikely at that or a later period.

The case for the poem as put by Bergk is a weak one, nor need it weigh with us if other reasons be found for supposing the attribution false. And Bergk's case is the whole case. Haeberlin has indeed a fourth argument elaborated from a theory of Wilamowitz, which is as follows. The *Syrinx* is, as has long been observed, closely related to another technopaegnium, the *Altar* of Dosiadas, and one of these two poems clearly imitates the other. Which of the two is the earlier is immaterial to Haeberlin's argument: he holds that since the two poems contain marked similarities of phrase, their authors must have been friends: Lycidas and Simichidas in the seventh Idyll are friends, and Simichidas is Theocritus: therefore Lycidas is Dosiadas and Theocritus wrote the *Syrinx*. This chain of reasoning I may safely leave to the consideration of the reader, and I will not pause to discuss the arguments with which its author seeks to support the identification of Lycidas with Dosiadas.

This closes the case for the defence. I shall now consider the evidence supplied, first, by ancient testimony, secondly by the manuscripts, and thirdly by the poem itself.

So far as the evidence of authors who quote the poem goes, there is little enough reason for supposing it to be by Theocritus, for it is doubtful if any writer refers to it as his work. The *Syrinx* is quoted by Psellus[1], and the scholiasts to Theocritus[2]

[1] Boissonade *Anecd. Gr.* iii. p. 208. Psellus, on the strength of a line in this same poem *τὴν δὲ βουκόλου σύριγγα τοῦ Θεοκρίτου μάθε* (p. 202), is ranged by Haeberlin among the defenders of the traditional ascription. The two preceding lines however speak of the *κιθάρα* of Anacreon and Pindar, and show clearly what Psellus meant.

[2] Ad. vii. 83. *πέπλασται τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κομάτα ὑπὸ Θεοκρίτου παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις οὐ παραλαμβανόμενα. ὑπὸ μελισσῶν τρεφόμενον <ἐποίησε> τὸν Κομάταν καθάπερ ὁ Δάφνις ἱστορεῖται· 'οὐχὶ κεράσταν ὅν ποτε θρέψατο ταυροπάτωρ'* [*Syrinx* v. 3]. This is obscure, but seems to imply that the writer took the mysterious Cerastes of the *Syrinx* to be Daphnis, not, as is usually assumed, Comatas. If he was right I cannot explain the riddle, but the equation Cerastes = Comatas also lacks plausible explanation. In any case the passage gives no reason

and Dionysius Thrax[1] without the author's name. There remain two doubtful allusions in Eustathius. In the first[2] Eustathius, commenting on the word *σῦριγξ*, says *ἔτι δὲ καὶ ποδὸς ἕλκος, ὡς ὁ Θεόκριτος*. But in the *Syrinx*, *ἕλκος* stands for *σῦριγξ* and not *vice versa*. Meineke therefore refers the passage to Ap. Rhod. iv. 1646, and Ahrens supplies, from Suidas, before the words *ὡς ὁ Θεόκριτος*, *<καὶ τὸ εἰς τὴν ὀπὴν τοῦ τροχοῦ ἐμβαλλόμενον μέρος τοῦ ἄξονος>*—a reference to *Id.* xxiv. 120. The other Eustathian allusion[3] is contained in the words *Θεοκρίτου στήτην τὴν γυναῖκα εἰπόντος* and this may really be a reference to *Syrinx*, 14. As, however, Tzetzes in his commentary on the *Iliad*[4] also cites this word, and cites it from the *Altar* of Dosiadas which he ascribes to Theocritus, it is quite possible that Eustathius has made the same mistake, for the word appears elsewhere always to be quoted from the *Altar* and not from the *Syrinx*[5].

Let us, however, admit that the mention of Theocritus here implies at least that one of the Technopaegnia passed in the time of Tzetzes and Eustathius as Theocritus's composition. The testimony of antiquity is limited to these allusions in the twelfth century[6]; and that Eustathius should believe the *Syrinx* to be by Theocritus, if he did believe it, is neither surprising nor important. The ascription is probably a good deal older than Eustathius[7], but it may yet be false.

The testimony of ancient witnesses therefore lends no support of any value to the view that the poem is by

to suppose that the writer ascribed the *Syrinx* to Theocritus; indeed it suggests that he did not.

[1] Bekker *Anec.* ii. p. 734, 30. The context suggests that the author's name was unknown to the writer.

[2] p. 1189, 47.

[3] p. 21, 42. [4] p. 68, 11.

[5] The authorship of the Technopaegnia is often confused. For example in one MS. the *Syrinx* is ascribed to Simias, in the Anthology the *Egg* is given to 'Besantinus' and 'Dosiadas or Simias,' and the *Axe* to 'Besantinus.'

[6] Suidas writes of Theocritus: *οὗτος ἔγραψε τὰ καλούμενα βουκολικὰ ἔπη Δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ. τινὲς δὲ ἀναφέρουσιν εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ταῦτα· Προιτίδας, Ἐλπίδας, Ὕμνους, Ἡρωίνας, Ἐπικήδεια, Μέλη, Ἐλεγείας, Ἰάμβους, Ἐπιγράμματα.* Even in this comprehensive list of doubtful works I see no room for the poem.

[7] The dates of the various hands in the MS. of the Anthology are disputed, but the hand which wrote the *Syrinx* is usually considered to be earlier than the twelfth century.

Theocritus. I pass to the evidence of the MSS., which is definitely hostile to that belief.

The *Syrinx* is preserved in the Palatine Anthology and in numerous bucolic MSS. which present a text similar but inferior to that of the anthology. The MSS. of Theocritus, as is well known, reveal by their contents the existence of various collections of Theocritean poems made at various dates, but though the *Syrinx* is found in MSS. which represent most if not all of these collections[1], the *Syrinx* itself does not belong to any of them[2]; it comes in, like other technopaegnia, to many MSS. of different classes, but it comes in only as a supplement[3] and it is omitted even from some MSS. which contain other technopaegnia[4]. These collections represent successive ancient editions of Theocritus, and the longer collections already include poems now recognised to be by other hands. The absence of the *Syrinx* which actually claims to be by Theocritus can therefore, as it seems to me, be explained only by two hypotheses. Either the editors had good reason to know that the poem was spurious[5], or it had disappeared and so escaped their researches.

The latter of these suppositions is the only one which can save the credit of the *Syrinx*[6], and it is not, I think, a very

[1] It occurs in the following MSS. : *b*, *c*, *p*, *r*, *t*, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 14, 18, *G*, *K*, *M*, *Z*, *Cant.*, *Can.* (I use Ahrens's symbols throughout), and probably in others of which full particulars are not available.

[2] It is not even in Hiller's supplementary collection Φ (Hiller, *Beiträge z. Textg. d. G. B.* p. 58[2]), though presence in that collection would be small evidence of authenticity.

[3] Its supplementary character is sometimes to be seen by its position. In 9, it, together with other technopaegnia and the *Europa* of Moschus, is separated from the other contents of the MS.; in *p*, the *Syrinx* and *Id.* xxii. come at the beginning and are separated from the other Theocritean poems by a medical fragment.

[4] Φ and *D* have the *Wings*, *q* the *Altar*, and *k* the *Wings* and the *Axe*, but not the *Syrinx*. *k* is the chief representative of the third collection, absence from which affords a strong presumption against authenticity (Ahrens, *Philologus*, 1874, p. 585).

[5] The most convincing evidence of spuriousness would of course be a knowledge of the real author's name.

[6] Wilamowitz (*Textgeschichte* p. 89), though he admits its absence from the known collections, claims that the poem obviously belonged originally to editions of Theocritus, and that this is confirmed by the quotation in the

plausible one. It is true that none of the ancient witnesses prove that the poem was known at a date previous to the compilation of these ancient editions[1], but reference to a poem so short and unimportant is largely a matter of accident, and silence proves nothing. As it so happens however solitary witnesses do survive to show that the technopaegnia of Simias and Dosiadas were not lost; Lucian and the author of the other *Altar*[2] allude to Dosiadas's *Altar*, and Hephaestion mentions the poems of Simias. The *Syrinx* deserves on its merits to be remembered before the *Altar* of Dosiadas and, had it ever been current as a work of Theocritus, I cannot think that it would have passed into an obscurity which spared the work of lesser poets, or escaped inclusion in the Theocritean corpus.

But even if we are prepared to face the adverse evidence of the MSS., the poem still cannot pass as Theocritean, for there remains another more fatal objection to it. Its shape shows it to be later than the time of Theocritus.

The syrinx here depicted consists of ten reeds, each represented by two lines of verse. The pipes decrease in length so that the last is roughly only one quarter of the length of the first. Arguments from the number of pipes in the syrinx are inadmissible. The commonest number is perhaps seven, but Theocritus speaks of nine[3], and examples of all numbers from four to twelve are supplied by the monuments[4]. No exception

scholia to *Id.* vii. 83. I can only reply that the MSS. are our only evidence for these collections and they prove that the *Syrinx* did not belong to the early editions of Theocritus. If citation by the scholiast is evidence that a poem belongs to bucolic tradition, then the scholia to the first Idyll alone show that Homer, Hesiod, Aristophanes, Sophocles, Euripides, Eupolis, Menander and Apollonius Rhodius also 'ursprünglich zu der Theocritausgabe gehörten.'

[1] All the dates are very uncertain. One of the editions, probably that represented by the third collection, seems to have been made by Eratosthenes in the time of Justinian. The reference in the scholia to *Id.* vii. cannot be dated, and we know nothing of the source from which the poem passed into the anthology except that it does not seem to come from Cephalas.

[2] This poem has been supposed also to contain a reminiscence of the *Syrinx*, but I think without sufficient reason: see p. 138.

[3] *Id.* viii. 18.

[4] Examples with more than nine reeds are not very common but the following may serve as instances:

can therefore be taken to the poem on this ground. The shape of the instrument is, however, of great importance, for it appears that the Pan-pipe with reeds decreasing in length was unknown in Greece until at least a century after the time of Theocritus.

Furtwaengler, an excellent witness, writes[1]: —'la forma rettangolare in generale senza dubbio è la più antica, perchè essa esclusivamente si trova in tutta l' arte fin al morir della pittura vasculare, mentre l' altra più nota a canne disuguali venne in uso soltanto coi monumenti Greco-Romani. La siringa più antica nell' arte è sul vaso François[2], ove la Musa Urania la suona, di forma rettangolare e di nove canne. Seguono dopo un longo intervallo, i monumenti del sec. quarto, specialmente le belle monete dell' Arcadia e di Sicilia, in cui Pane umano ha sempre codesta siringa di canne eguali, e tale si scorge pur anco in tutti i migliori esemplari di quel Pane attico caprino avvolto nella pelle.' So far as I have been able to test this statement, it is amply borne out by the monumental evidence. The rectangular syrinx appears on the coins of Messana[3], Syracuse[4], and Macedon[5]; it occurs as a symbol on the coins of the Achaean League down to the year 250 B.C.[6] and as a type on those of Arcadia down to 234[7]. The south Italian vases, whose production goes on to about the end of the third century, never show the form presented by our poem. The syrinx with reeds of unequal length appears on a number of Roman coins between the years 90 and 80 B.C.[8], and these are the earliest certain instances known to me in Greek or Roman art[9]; it may, I think, be asserted with some confidence

10, *Mus. Borb.* ii. pl. 25 : 11, *Monumenti* iii. 5 : 12, *Annali* 1877 pl. M.

[1] *Annali* 1877, p. 214 (=*Kleine Schriften* i. pp. 157 f.). To the same effect Tillyard in *J. H. S.* xxvii. p. 167.

[2] [*F.-R.-H.*, T. i.]

[3] Gardner, *Types of Gr. Coins*, pl. II. 42.

[4] Bronze coin in the McClean collection, Cambridge, cf. *Num. Chron.* 1908, pp. 14 f.

[5] B. M. Cat. *Macedon*, p. 93.

[6] Ib. *Peloponnese*, pl. II. 8.

[7] Ib. pl. XXXII. 12—19, 21, cf. 10.

[8] Babelon *Monn. d. l. Rép. Rom.* i. p. 249 (gens Calpurnia), ii. p. 192 (C. Martius Censorinus), p. 539 (C. Vibius Pansa), Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic* i. 326, 330 (L. Junius Bursio), *ib.* 375 (Lucius Papius).

[9] It occurs much earlier on Etruscan monuments (e.g. bronze situla in

that the form was unknown in the East until the spread of Roman influence in the second century before Christ[1].

The *Syrinx* then represents a shape of instrument which was not known until long after the time of Theocritus, and it follows that the poem cannot be by Theocritus. Mr J. M. Edmonds, who saw this paper some time ago, has indeed argued[2] that the lines of the poem may stand, not for the actual reeds of the instrument, but for the notes they produced; but his defence is, I think, untenable. The other Technopaegnia all represent material objects, and that the *Syrinx* is not exceptional in this respect can be proved. The poet arranges his lines in pairs of equal length; it is clear therefore that the breadth as well as the length of the object represented by each pair was of importance, and consequently that the object is an actual reed, not a musical note which, if represented graphically, can have only one dimension[3].

Beyond the fact that the author cannot be Theocritus or any of his contemporaries[4] there is little to be ascertained about him. The *Syrinx* is, as has been said, closely related to another technopaegnium, the *Altar* of Dosiadas. Both poems play upon the words μέροψ, δίζως, and ἀπάτωρ; they

Bôlogna, phot. Poppi 2536) side by side with the rectangular form (e.g. bronze lamp at Cortona, *Monumenti*, 1844, pl. X.), and probably came to Rome from Etruria. The monuments show some traces of an intermediate form in which half the reeds are level at the bottom, and half sloped. In the rectangular form the tone was produced, not (as has been conjectured) by cutting holes diagonally across the instrument or by the use of natural knots in the reeds, but by stopping each reed to the required depth with wax. The process is described by Aristotle *Probl.* xix. 23.

[1] I cite no evidence from sculpture owing to the untrustworthy nature of Roman copies, and the difficulty of dating works of this period. The rectangular form occurs on a relief of Paris in the Terme (Baumeister fig. 1359) which is either a Hellenistic original, or a good Roman copy. Mr Tillyard informs me that the earliest sculptured example of the uneven shape known to him occurs on a small group in the Vatican (Amelung ii. p. 355), apparently a poor Roman copy of a Hellenistic work.

[2] *The Greek Bucolic Poets*, pp. 500 f.

[3] I do not understand Mr Edmonds when he says 'the doubling of the lines is to be explained as a mere evolutionary survival.'

[4] The ascription to Simias in the manuscript *G* is no doubt a mere slip, and Simias is ruled out by the shape of the instrument no less than Theocritus.

stand together and alone in Greek literature in using the mysterious word *στήτη* for *γύνη*[1]; in the *Altar* Θεόκριτος stands for Paris, in the *Syrinx*, Paris for Theocritus. Such coincidences cannot be accidental, but it is not quite certain which poem imitates the other. To me it seems unlikely that anyone in search of a disguise for the name Theocritus, would hit independently upon Paris[2], whereas a poet seeking a name which meant 'judge of gods' might very well choose to interpret Θεόκριτος in this way in default of a more suitable name. I conclude therefore that Paris = Theocritus of the *Syrinx* is derived from Theocritus = Paris of the *Altar*, and that the *Syrinx* is the later of the two poems[3]. Still, this fact, even if it were invincibly established, would help us little, for we know nothing of Dosiadas, the author of the *Altar*, except that he borrows from Lycophron, is mentioned by Lucian[4] and therefore lived in the interval between these writers.

The author of the *Syrinx* borrows from Theocritus the phrase *πᾶξεν ἕλκος* and perhaps *ἀδὺ μελίσδοις* and *ἔχει πόθον*[5]. Two of his puzzles occur in a riddle quoted by Sextus Empiricus[6], but here the imitation might be either way. The motive of his poem—the dedication of pastoral pipes by a pastoral poet to the pastoral god who invented them—is so natural and appropriate in itself, that it may dispense with authority. If it be necessary to find a source of inspiration, one may think of the second Theocritean epigram, in which Daphnis dedicates his pipes to Pan—an epigram which appears to have inspired Eratosthenes[7].

[1] It has been ingeniously explained as arising from a false reading *διὰ στήτην ἐρίσαντε* at *Il.* i. 6.

[2] Since Θεόκριτος means, at any rate most naturally, 'judged by god' or 'by gods,' and would suggest, let us say, Ares tried by his peers for the murder of Halirrothius.

[3] Wilamowitz *Textg. d. Gr. Buk.* p. 246, argues that the *Syrinx* is the original, but with singularly little success.

[4] *Lexiphanes* 25. Even if we reject (with Hecker and Wilamowitz) the statement of the Palatine Anthology, that he was a Rhodian and identify him with a Cretan historian of the name, we do not get very much further. The historian is mentioned by Diodorus, but his date cannot be more nearly determined.

[5] Cf. *Id.* xi. 15 f., and iv. 28 f., i. 1—3, vii. 99.

[6] *τὸ ὅλον* = Πᾶν, *ἕλκος* = *σῦριγξ*: Sext. Emp. *Adv. Gr.* i. 13, p. 314.

[7] *A. P.* vi. 78.

So much for *Quellenforschung* which gives us no help in determining who the author may have been. And indeed, beyond a *terminus post quem* of about 150 B.C., supplied by the shape of the instrument, there is nothing to go on, for the reference in the Theocritean scholia cannot be dated and the others are all very late[1]. The second *Altar* by 'Besantinus' appears to have been written in the time of Hadrian, and the Latin technopaegnia of Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius (which include a *Syrinx*) in the reign of Constantine. The composition of technopaegnia was not the whim of a few decades only, and we have nothing to guide us. The gifts required for such productions are not of a high order, and Lexiphanes, whom Lucian cautions against Lycophron and Dosiadas, might well have attained a considerable notoriety in composing works of the kind. It would be possible to think of Dosiadas himself as the author of the *Syrinx*, or of 'Besantinus' who borrows from Dosiadas, or of Eratosthenes, whose epigram, already mentioned, shows that he was interested in Theocritus[2] and did not shrink from the sincerest form of flattery. But such speculations serve no useful end, and we may be content to leave the author unknown; for, so long as the poem be no longer ascribed to Theocritus, neither its author nor the date at which it was composed is of much importance.

A. S. F. GOW.

[1] I cannot think that *πατέρων πάντων πάτερ αὐτοπάτωρ προπάτωρ ἀπάτωρ* in Synesius's Hymn to the Trinity (iii. 145) is, as Wilamowitz supposes, a reminiscence of *Syrinx* 15 *κλωποπάτωρ ἀπάτωρ*. Haeberlin's supposed reminiscence in the Ionic *Altar* (*Altar* 5 *πάματα Παυός=μῆλα*: *Syrinx* 11 *τυφλοφόρων πᾶμα=σῦριγξ*) is more doubtful but may very well be accidental.

[2] He is probably the Eratosthenes who wrote the hypotheses to certain Idylls preserved in our scholia (Ahrens *Buc.* ii. p. xxxiii).

THREE PASSAGES OF CICERO'S LETTERS.

I venture to criticise the reading or interpretation of the Dublin editors in three passages of Cicero's Letters.

1. ad Atticum vii 3 5 quem cum ornauit Cato, declarauit iis se solis non inuidere, quibus nihil aut non multum ad dignitatem posset accedere.

Cicero is much vexed with Cato, who had proposed in the Senate a *supplicatio* in honour of Bibulus but had declined to do as much for Cicero.

The question is whether the first *non* in the extract should be retained or rejected. The editors retain *non*, and speak of the rashness of rejecting it; they add: "the sentiment without *non* is so pointless as to be scarcely worth repeating; 'Cato declared that the only people he envied were those whose dignity admitted of little or no accession.'" But this is a mistranslation: *ornauit* is translated as if it were *ornaret*, and *declarauit* as if it were *confirmauit*.

The mistranslation is most unfair to the interpretation rejected. The sense requires us to reject *non*, and the meaning is: "Cato, by the act of paying distinction to Bibulus, showed that he had no jealousy of such an obscure person but only of a highly distinguished man like me."

This gives excellent sense, whereas any translation which keeps *non* is very flat.

2. ad Atticum vii 18 2 haec optima in malis, quoniam illius alterum consulatum a re publica ne data quidem occasione reppulimus.

The editors translate the last words: 'even when everything was against us, we refused him a second consulship.'

Both the Latin and the logic are against this interpretation. For surely *reppulimus* must be negatived by the preceding *ne quidem*, and also the *quoniam* clause should describe some fault or error of the senatorial party.

Besides, Cicero again and again reproaches Pompey for having offered even after Jan. 20th 49 the consulship for 48 to Caesar, and justifies slackness on his own part and overtures to Caesar on this very ground. Consider the following passages: ad Att. vii 26 2 *plane eum, cui noster alterum consulatum deferret et triumphum,...inimicum habere nolueram*; ib. viii 11 D 7 (to Pompey) *eius, cui tum, cum iam in armis essemus, consulatus tamen alter et triumphus amplissimus deferebatur*; ib. viii 12 2 *eius, cui Pompeius iam armatus armato consulatum triumphumque deferret.*

Hence I infer the meaning to be: "Caesar, by open breach of the constitution, gave us a chance to refuse him that second consulship. We did not take it but, after the council at Teanum in January, offered him through Pompey the consulship and a triumph to boot."

3. ad Atticum viii 3 6 at si restitero et fuerit nobis in hac parte locus, idem fecero quod in Cinnae dominatione L. Philippus, quod L. Flaccus, quod Q. Mucius, quoquo modo ea res huic quidem cecidit, qui tamen ita dicere solebat se id fore uidere, quod factum est, sed malle quam armatum ad patriae moenia accedere. aliter Thrasybulus et fortasse melius. sed est certa quaedam illa Mucii ratio atque sententia, est illa etiam [Philippi], et, cum sit necesse seruire tempori et non amittere tempus, cum sit datum.

Cicero is discussing the possibility of remaining in Italy after Pompey's departure and taking some part on Caesar's side. He quotes certain parallels from history.

The editors (Baiter, Watson, Tyrrell) here expel *Philippi* as an 'erroneous gloss'; but the word is really essential to the meaning.

The key to the passage is to take *seruire tempori* rightly. It means 'to hold a candle to the devil,' to do, because you must, something which you ought not to do: cf. *tempori*

pareamus (ad Att. vii 18 2). Philippus' action (see Mommsen III p. 331) could not be better described than in this sentence: he accepted office under the revolutionary government (*tempori paruit*); he then, when he got the chance, deserted to Sulla (*non amisit tempus, cum est datum*).

Hence Cicero means: "to act like Mucius, i.e. to remain at Rome in a revolution and lose your life in consequence, is a conceivable policy; but so is that of Philippus, who remained and yet contrived to save his skin. The third policy, that of Thrasybulus, who left Athens and then returned to overthrow the Thirty Tyrants, is perhaps better than the other two."

J. D. DUFF.

ON AN ORACLE IN PROCOPIUS, *DE BELLO GOTHICO* I XXIV.

ἐν μέντοι Ῥώμῃ τῶν τινες πατρικίων τὰ Σιβύλλης λόγια προὔφερον, ἰσχυριζόμενοι τὸν κίνδυνον τῇ πόλει ἄχρι ἐς τὸν Ἰούλιον μῆνα γεγενῆσθαι μόνον. χρῆναι γὰρ τότε βασιλέα Ῥωμαίοις καταστῆναί τινα, ἐξ οὗ δὴ Γετικὸν οὐδὲν Ῥώμῃ τὸ λοιπὸν δείσειε. Γετικὸν γάρ φασιν ἔθνος τοὺς Γοτθοὺς εἶναι· εἶχε δὲ τὸ λόγιον ὧδε· ἦν τι ηοιμεν ζε και ι βευνω, καί κάτε νη σι γρ᾽ σο ενιπιήν ἔτι συπιαπιετα. πέμπτον δὲ μῆνα τὸν Ἰούλιον ἰσχυρίζοντο εἶναι, οἱ μέν, ὅτι Μαρτίου ἱσταμένου ἡ πολιορκία κατ᾽ ἀρχὰς γέγονεν, ἀφ᾽ οὗ δὴ πέμπτον Ἰούλιον ξυμβαίνει εἶναι, οἱ δέ, ὅτι Μάρτιον πρῶτον πρὸ τῆς Νουμᾶ βασιλείας ἐνόμιζον μῆνα, ὅτε δὴ Ῥωμαίοις ἐς δέκα μῆνας ὁ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ χρόνος ξυνῄει, Ἰούλιός τε ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ Κυιντίλιος ὠνομάζετο. ἀλλ᾽ ἦν ἄρα τούτων οὐδὲν ὑγιές. οὔτε γὰρ βασιλεὺς τότε Ῥωμαίοις κατέστη, καὶ ἡ πολιορκία ἐνιαυτῷ ὕστερον διαλυθήσεσθαι ἔμελλε, καὶ αὖθις ἐπὶ Τουτίλα Γότθων ἄρχοντος ἐς τοὺς ὁμοίους Ῥώμῃ κινδύνους ἰέναι, ὥς μοι ἐν τοῖς ὄπισθε λελέξεται λόγοις. δοκεῖ γάρ μοι οὐ ταύτην δὴ τὴν τῶν βαρβάρων ἔφοδον τὸ μαντεῖον δηλοῦν, ἀλλ᾽ ἑτέραν τινὰ ἢ ἤδη ξυμβᾶσαν ἢ ὕστερόν ποτε ἐσομένην.

In the above transcript I have given the oracle as, according to Haury, it appears in *L*. For a facsimile of the text of *K*, see Haury's note. In the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* XV (1906), J. B. Bury reconstructs as follows:

Quintili mensē si rex$\left.\begin{matrix}\\ g\end{matrix}\right\}$ ⏑⏑ – at in arce
– ⏑⏑ – ⏑ nihil Geticum iam Roma timeto.

In the *Journal of Philology* XXX 225—228, I tried to restore a Latin oracle recorded by Procopius *de bello Gothico*

I vii. There, a Greek scribe, ignorant of Latin, reproduces those letters which he recognizes as Greek—giving, for example, C as sigma—and imitates all else in rude facsimile. In the passage before us he has in like manner reproduced letters which seemed to be familiar: but, if I am not mistaken, instead of attempting a facsimile he has altogether omitted what was strange to him, adding *καί—καί—ἔτι*, to connect his fragmentary reproductions, and *γρ'*, to mark CO ENIITIHY as an alternative transliteration. In short, I think that the scribe wrote, and that we ought to keep in our text, *εἶχε δὲ τὸ λόγιον ὧδε·* HN TI HOIMEN ZE *καὶ* I BENYO *καὶ* KATE NH CI *γρ'* COENIITIHY *ἔτι* CYTIIA TIIETA. Thus far, I seem to myself to be on firm ground.

It remains to inquire whether we can form any conjecture about the Latin text which perplexed the Greek scribe. Now Procopius' paraphrase tells us that, according to the oracle, a new emperor was to come to the throne in the fifth month, and thenceforward Rome would have no Getic alarms: and the subsequent comment implies that the latter part of the prophecy guaranteed, not only present relief, but also future immunity. The word "Getic" is especially certified: and, whereas several of the editors suppose *Quintilis* to have been mentioned, the controversy of which Procopius speaks shows that the oracle mentioned, not *Quintilis*, but *quintus mensis*. Further, in the paraphrase, the words *Γετικὸν οὐδὲν Ῥώμῃ τὸ λοιπὸν δείσειε* [qu. *δείσεται*] suggest *Geticum nihil Roma timebit*.

Now, (1) it is obvious to find *quinto mense* in HN TI HOIMEN ZE; (2) *βενυω* (compare *K* in Haury's note) may well represent *regnum*; (3) CYTIIA TIIETA suggests *copia picta*: and if, with due regard to the metre, we combine these fragments with *Geticum nihil Roma timebit*, we shall have

quinto mense.....regnum.....timebit
Roma nihil Geticum.....copia picta.....

Can we fill the gaps in these defective hexameters in such a way that the oracle shall announce the accession of a new emperor, and shall promise that the so-called Getae will retire

and will not return? I think that the oracle may have run somehow thus:

quinto mense, ⟨nouo⟩ regnum ⟨capiente⟩, timebit
Roma nihil Geticum ⟨neque⟩ copia picta ⟨redibit⟩.

But of course I am here venturing into the region of speculation.

It will be seen that I suppose ΚΑΤΕ ΝΗ CI to represent *capient-*. For *picti* as an epithet of barbarians, Mr Duff kindly points out to me Martial x 72, 7 pictorum sola basiate regum.

HENRY JACKSON.

27 *July* 1913[1].

[1] The substance of this note was communicated to the Cambridge Philological Society 18 November 1909.

HESIOD'S WAGON

W.D. 422 *τῆμος ἄρ' ὑλοτομεῖν μεμνημένος ὥρια ἔργα.*
ὄλμον μὲν τριπόδην τάμνειν, ὕπερον δὲ τρίπηχυν,
ἄξονα δ' ἑπταπόδην· μάλα γάρ νύ τοι ἄρμενον οὕτω·
εἰ δέ κεν ὀκταπόδην, ἀπὸ καὶ σφῦράν κε τάμοιο.
τρισπίθαμον δ' ἀψὶν τάμνειν δεκαδώρῳ ἀμάξῃ.

Hesiod's remarks on the wagon are so cursory and obscure that his meaning must always remain a matter for plausible conjecture rather than for rigorous proof. Two explanations of this passage are now in the field, and since both seem to me open to serious objection, I venture to propose yet a third. For the theory put forward in the following pages I should claim not that it is demonstrably true but that it is consistent with the evidence and intrinsically more probable than either of the two views at present current.

Of the three nouns used by Hesiod in connexion with the wagon, *ἄξων*, *ἀψίς*, *ἄμαξα*, the meaning of the first alone is quite certain. *Ἄξων* must mean 'axle,' for that is always the chief meaning of the word and the secondary meanings are all late and irrelevant to this context.

Ἀψίς on the other hand may mean a variety of things. The word occurs only once in Homer, and in the phrase *ἀψῖσι λίνου* used of a fishing net[1], where *ἀψίς* is said to mean 'fastenings.' In later writers the word is used of a solid disc, such as a potter's wheel[2] or the sun[3], of the whole periphery of a spoked wheel[4], of the segment of a circle[5], of the vault of heaven[6], of an arch[7], and apparently of the ribs of a ship[8].

[1] *Il.* v. 487.
[2] *Anth. Plan.* 191.
[3] Eur. *Ion* 88; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 889 f.
[4] Herod. iv. 72; cf. Eur. *Hip.* 1233, Plut. *Mor.* 376 d.
[5] Arist. *Meteor.* p. 371, 28.
[6] Plat. *Phaedr.* 247 B, Lucian ii. 832, etc.
[7] Dio Cass. liii. 26, etc.
[8] Ar. *Thesm.* 53.

The doubts as to the meaning of ἄμαξα are less fundamental. Originally the word seems to have meant not the whole wagon but only the wheeled framework or *chassis*. When Priam goes to ransom the body of Hector he orders his sons ἄμαξαν εὐτροχον ἡμιονείην ὁπλίσαι[1] and they get out the ἄμαξα and fit it with the pole (ῥυμός) and the body (πείρινς, elsewhere called also ὑπερτερίη)[2]. The complete vehicle is often mentioned in the subsequent narrative, but it is, with one exception, called always ἀπήνη not ἄμαξα[3]. We are therefore entitled to suppose that ἄμαξα means properly the *chassis*, ἀπήνη the whole structure, and this distinction, though it is not so clearly implied in the *Odyssey*, is on the whole consistent with the passages in which the words occur[4]. Now for certain purposes a wheeled framework has obvious advantages over a finished wagon and it is employed to this day for carting timber and other large objects. We may therefore be certain that in Hesiod's wagon framework and body were separate and the body of secondary importance; and though in his time the word ἄμαξα may have included the body, it does not seem likely that where three parts of the wagon alone are given, any of them should refer to the detachable ὑπερτερίη.

The description of Priam's ἀπήνη suggests one further point. The wagon is called τετράκυκλος[5], and the epithet is ornamental not distinctive, for it is introduced incidentally into the narrative of Priam's journey, not in the passage where the preparations are described. Probably therefore four was the normal number of wheels to an ἄμαξα in Homeric times. The Great Bear, which is already called ἄμαξα in Homer, rather suggests a four-wheeled wagon[6] and, though, later on, the commonest form of cart in Greece had two wheels[7] and four-wheeled vehicles are

[1] *Il.* xxiv. 189, 263.

[2] 265 ff.

[3] 275, 324, 447, 578, 590, 718. Αμαξα in 711.

[4] The most important are those dealing with Nausicaa's expedition: *Od.* vi. 37, 57, 69, 72, 73, 78, 88, 90, 252, 260. In the last ἄμαξα stands for the whole vehicle; the others are consistent with the distinction.

[5] *Il.* xxiv. 324; cf. *Od.* ix. 242, Herod. i. 188, ii. 63.

[6] The four stars of the Bear are sometimes identified with the corners, sometimes with the wheels of the wagon: Schol. *Od.* v. 273, Schol. Arat. 27.

[7] The two-wheeled cart is discussed

rarely represented on the monuments, it is noticeable that on Dipylon vases, which descend probably to the eighth century and so to the Hesiodic period, four-wheeled vehicles are as common as or commoner than two-wheeled[1]. We are therefore entitled, in default of further evidence, to assume that Hesiod's wagon had four wheels.

So much for the nouns. Secondly as to the dimensions, *ἄξονα ἑπταπόδην, τρισπίθαμον ἀψῖνα* and *δεκαδώρῳ ἁμάξῃ*. *Δῶρον* is the measure more usually called *παλαιστή*, a 'palm[2]'; *σπιθαμή* is a 'span.' To Hesiod the words probably meant merely what they said, and his farmer took the dimensions of his timber from his own person. Subsequently all three words became standard measures of length, and since for this enquiry we require some approximate dimensions, we may accept the evidence of these standards as a rough guide to Hesiod's meaning. The 'foot' and the 'span' are both reducible to 'palms,' for a *σπιθαμή* is three *παλαισταί* and a *πούς* four[3]. In *παλαισταί* therefore the dimensions are: *ἄξων*, 28; *ἅμαξα*, 10; *ἀψίς*, 9, or roughly in English measurements, 7 ft. 1 in., 2 ft. 6 in. and 2 ft. 3 in.[4] The data for our enquiry are therefore an axle of 7 ft. 1 in., probably a four-wheeled *chassis* of which some dimension is 2 ft. 6 in., and some unknown part of 2 ft. 3 in. With these preliminaries we can consider the current theories of the wagon.

The traditional explanation given by the scholiasts and accepted by several modern critics[5], is that the line

τρισπίθαμον δ' ἀψὶν τάμνειν δεκαδώρῳ ἁμάξῃ

by Miss Lorimer (*The Country Cart of Ancient Greece*: *J. H. S.* xxiii. pp. 133 ff.); its parts are described by Pollux i. 253; cf. Plat. *Theaet.* 207 A.

[1] Four-wheeled vehicles may be seen on the following Dipylon vases: Athens, 199, 214, and a fragment in the museum of the British School (*B.S.A.* xii. p. 82); and on a Boeotian geometric vase, Munich, 400. A similar cart occurs in the Hallstatt culture (cf. Hoernes, *Urgesch. d. bildend. Kunst*, Taf. xxx., xxxi.). Homer's *ἅπηναι* are drawn by mules (cf. however *Il.* xxiv. 782), and horses or mules draw the Dipylon vehicles. Hesiod's *ἅμαξα* is an ox-cart (*W.D.* 453) and so is the Great Bear, for his driver is Bootes: cf. Schol. Arat. 91.

[2] Pollux ii. 157, Hesych. Suid. *Et. Magn.* s.v. etc.

[3] Script. Metr. pp. 182, 184, 188, 193 (ed. Hultsch), etc.

[4] On Hultsch's estimate of 7·71 cm. to the *παλαιστή*.

[5] Paley and Waltz *ad loc.*, Grashof,

contains wheel measurements only. The wheel is ten palms in diameter and its felloe is composed of four arcs (*ἀψῖδες*) each nine palms in outside length. This view involves a difficulty noted by the scholiasts that if the circumference is 36 palms, the diameter should be 12 rather than 10, but the sections have to be trimmed and fitted together and this difficulty does not seem to me fatal. Nor is it impossible that *ἀψίς* should mean a segment, though in connexion with wheels the word usually denotes the whole wheel whether solid or spoked[1]. The chief difficulties lie in the assumptions that in each felloe there must be four *ἀψῖδες*, and that the phrase *δεκάδωρος ἄμαξα* can give the diameter of the wheel. *Ἄμαξα* nowhere else has the meaning 'wheel' which some would give it here, and if it means 'wagon' or '*chassis*,' then 'a ten-palm wagon' cannot reasonably be interpreted 'a wagon with wheels ten palms in diameter,' since the height of the wheel is not a natural criterion for estimating the size of the wagon.

A different interpretation of the passage is given by Thraemer[2]. He takes *ἀψίς* to be the whole wheel and *τρισπίθαμον* to give its diameter. The wagon, he says, is marked to be about six feet wide by the given length of the axle; the measurement of ten palms must therefore refer to the body—probably to its height. I have, however, given reasons for supposing that, even if *ἄμαξα* includes the body, Hesiod's wagon had a detachable body, and the height of its sides was in the main a matter of taste, hardly conditioned by the diameter of the wheels and certainly not likely to condition that diameter. The length of the body is a more important dimension, but 2 ft. 6 in. is clearly too short to be the length.

The considerations which lead me to propose a new interpretation are two in number. The first is that if a wagon or the *chassis* of a wagon is to be characterised by one dimension, that dimension ought to be either its length or its width. The second is that for a primitive wagon, an axle-length of seven

Das Fuhrwerk b. Homer u. Hesiod, pp. 10, 33; H. Schenkl, *Zu "Αμαξα* (*Ztschrft f. vergl. Sprachf.* 1907), p. 239.

[1] It perhaps means a section of the felloe in a verse quoted by Plutarch *Mor.* 103 f.

[2] *Strassburger Festschrift z. xlvi. Vers. Deutscher Phil.* 1901, pp. 298 ff.

feet is preposterous. And in this second objection I have the support of Tzetzes, who says, *νῦν δὲ περὶ τοῦ τῆς ἁμάξης ἄξονος λέγει κακῶς ὅτι ἑπτὰ ποδῶν δεῖ ἔχειν αὐτὸν τὸ πλάτος· μόλις γὰρ ἂν ἄξων ὑπερβαίη τοὺς δ' πόδας.* When therefore Hesiod bids his hearer cut *ἄξονα ἑπταπόδην*, I strongly suspect him of meaning 'cut a seven foot piece which you can use for axles,' that is for the two axles which we have seen reason to suppose his *ἅμαξα* required. But if the seven foot piece is not for one axle but for two, that gives us an axle-length of three and a half feet or 14 *παλαισταί*, and it becomes possible to understand the other dimension of 10 *παλαισταί*. That dimension ought, as I said, to refer to length or breadth, and for length it is obviously too short. Now, however, we are free to understand it of breadth, for if the *ἅμαξα* has a rough flooring 10 palms in width or measures 10 palms between the wheels, then 14 palms is a reasonable length for the axle. In English measurements it gives us a cart 2 ft. 6 in. across with an axle of 3 ft. 6½ in., that is with six inches to spare on either side to allow for the attachment of the wheels[1].

A vehicle with an extreme breadth of less than four feet may seem at first sight improbable to those familiar with the large wagons used on the well paved roads and streets of modern Europe. Tzetzes's statement that four feet was the maximum length of an axle shows however that in his day such a cart would have caused no surprise, and in the streets of Pompeii the wheel-ruts are no more than 90 cm. apart[2]. In historical times

[1] The amount which should be allowed for the projection of the axles beyond the flooring of the wagon depends on three factors which we have no means of determining. They are, (i) the method of attaching the wheels to the axle, (ii) the breadth of the wheel-tread, and (iii) the attachment of the front wheels and axle. If the front axle is pivoted, then room must be allowed for the axle to be slanted without bringing the felloe into contact with the floor or body of the cart. On Dipylon vases the floor of the vehicle is always shown at a considerable height above the top of the wheel, and though this may be due to primitive draughtsmanship, it possibly indicates that the flooring was raised on posts above the axles in order to allow free play for the wheels below the floor when the vehicle was turned. This is a characteristic of modern Italian bullock-carts: *Peasant Art in Italy* (*The Studio* 1913) figs. 376—378.

[2] Overbeck *Pompeii*[4], p. 59.

in Greece the width of the ordinary cart seems to have been somewhat greater, since, according to Curtius[1], the wheel-ruts have a width of 5 ft. 4 in. That wagons in prehistoric Greece should have been wider than they were in historical times is in itself highly improbable, for increase in axle-length means decrease in strength. Moreover excavation has shown that in some prehistoric towns a 7 ft. vehicle would have been an impossibility. The two surviving gates of the Homeric Troy for example, had a width of 1·80 and about 2·50 m.[2], and the streets of Mycenae are sometimes not five feet wide[3], yet both Troy and Mycenae are *εὐρυάγυιαι*. At Palaekastro the streets vary from 1·40 to 2·50 m. and they are wider than those of Phylakopi[4]. The great road at Knossos has a width of 3·60 m., but the central paved causeway, which was presumably meant for vehicles, is only 1·40 m. in width[5]. It is further to be remembered that the wheel-tracks on the roads of Greece were designed in the main for light travelling carts, and the Homeric *ἅμαξα* is not for travelling at all. It is used for carting stones or timber[6], Hector's ransom and body, or the palace washing. Nausicaa, being a woman, rides on it, but Priam follows behind in his *δίφρος*. Hesiod's wagon, we may be sure, was not meant for scouring Boeotia but for carrying heavy weights in the neighbourhood of the farm, and I think we shall be safe in asserting that 3 ft. 6 in. is a reasonable, 7 ft. a highly improbable length for its axle.

That Hesiod has expressed himself obscurely must be admitted, but on no hypothesis of his meaning can he be acquitted of this charge, and indeed lucidity is not one of his virtues. In the present case however there is this to be said

[1] *Zur Gesch. des Wegebaus b. d. Griech.* (*Abhandl. d. Berl. Akad.* 1854), p. 233. Curtius cites no evidence, but Ross (*Zeitschrift f. Alt.* 1852, p. 113) mentions three roads where the extreme width of the wheel-ruts is 5 ft. 4, 5 ft. 3, and 5 ft. 2.

[2] Doerpfeld, *Troja u. Ilion*, pp. 128, 136. Of the gateway known as VI T, which was probably the main entrance to the city, no remains have been found, but as the road leading up to it is only just over 3 m. wide the gate cannot have been much broader than the others.

[3] Tsountas and Manatt, *The Mycenaean Age*, p. 34.

[4] *B.S.A.* ix. p. 278.

[5] *B.S.A.* x. pp. 47 ff.

[6] *Il.* xii. 448, xxiv. 782 ff., *Od.* x. 103.

for him, and it is, I think, an important consideration. He is not here giving instructions for the building of a wagon at all, but only for the cutting of timber. With the subsequent treatment of the seven foot axle-piece he is no more concerned than with the three foot mortar. They are merely raw material. The mortar has subsequently to be hollowed out into the required shape, the axle-piece has to be cut in two and trimmed. It will even be convenient to cut it a foot longer than you require, for then you may make a mallet-head of the spare piece. To the woodcutter it is a saving of labour to cut the wood in one piece, and later on it will be an advantage, for it ensures uniformity in this most vulnerable part of the vehicle[1]. If, moreover, Hesiod's hearers knew that the axle of an ἄμαξα was never more than four feet in length they would be in little danger of misunderstanding.

So far then I think Hesiod's meaning ascertainable. His third dimension must however remain uncertain owing to the doubt as to the meaning of the word *ἀψίς*. The word is so constantly applied to wheels and circular objects that it is only natural to understand it so here. Homer, however, does not so use it, and, if *ἀψίς* in *ἀψῖσι λίνου* really means, as the scholiast says, *τοῖς ἄμμασι καὶ ταῖς συναφαῖς τοῦ λίνου*[2], then Hesiod may not be referring to the wheels at all. The beam, for example, which joins the two axles and serves as a support for the flooring[3] might perhaps be called *ἀψίς*. This beam is an important part of the wagon and might suitably be mentioned here, but the dimensions of the *ἀψίς*, 2 ft. 3 in., though perhaps not impossibly small, certainly tell against such an interpretation.

On the whole therefore I incline to refer this dimension to the wheels. And if to the wheels, then I agree with Thraemer that it is probably the diameter. So far as the size of the wheel is concerned, it makes little difference whether we take

[1] Cf. *W.D.* 693, *Il.* v. 838.

[2] *ἀψις* is glossed *συναφή* also at Ap. Rhod. iii. 138.

[3] I learn from Ginzrot's portentous tomes (*Die Wagen u. Fahrwerke d. Griech. u. Röm.* vol. i. p. 112) that this bar was called *στάθμιον*, *pertica*, but I can find no evidence for the statement.

this view or accept the statement of the scholiasts that ἀψίς is the fourth part of the felloe. This interpretation however does not carry conviction by its intrinsic merits, and there is always the possibility that Hesiod's wagon had no felloe but was the solid block-wheel, known to Virgil and still surviving in the remoter countrysides of Europe[1]. In favour of the view that the phrase τρισπίθαμον ἀψίν gives us some measurement of the wheel, it is to be noted that the dimensions of the wheel, as Hesiod's language seems to demand, are intimately connected with the breadth of the wagon, for the stability of the vehicle depends on the relative proportions of height and breadth.

Into the construction of the wheels I will not now go, since the available evidence throws no important light on our passage. It remains only to add that if 2 ft. 3 in. is really the diameter of the wheel, then we can guess roughly the length and height of the ἄμαξα. The wheels of ancient wagons, to judge from the representations in art, are set closely together, and 2 ft. is probably as much clear space as we need allow between them. This would give us a length between the axles of 4 ft. 3 in. Add about two feet for the projection of the flooring at the two ends, and we have an approximate total length of six or seven feet which fits well enough with the other dimensions. The ἄμαξα must have been very low, for if the wheels were only 2 ft. 3 in. in diameter, the axle can only have been about a foot above the ground[2].

[1] Virgil *Georg.* ii. 144, Probus ad *Georg.* i. 163: see Dr Haddon's interesting article on the Evolution of the Cart (*The Study of Man*, pp. 161 ff.). There is, it should be said, no evidence for this form of wheel in early Greece, and, if, as Prof. Ridgeway has argued (*Origin and Influence of the Thoroughbred Horse*, pp. 482 ff.), the block-wheel is not a primitive survival but a cheap substitute for the spoked wheel, then it may have been unknown in Hesiod's time. It occurs, however, on a monument of Rameses the Third (c. 1200 B.C.), figured by Thraemer, which represents a slaughter of the Puleshti or Purosati. These people, as Mr H. R. Hall kindly informs me, are usually supposed to be the Philistines, whose earlier home was in Lycia.

[2] A small wheel is necessitated by the narrowness of the wagon, and that this is not impossibly small may be seen from the illustrations to Dr Haddon's paper already mentioned. From this source I learn of block-wheels 18, 20 and 22½ in. in height used in Great Britain in the eighteenth century, and an archaic wooden wheel from Mercurago about 2 ft. in diameter is figured by Miss Lorimer (*J.H.S.*

The body, when it was used, would of course add considerably to the height[1].

These last dimensions are necessarily very rough and they depend on an uncertain interpretation. They suggest however a vehicle, small indeed, but strong and serviceable for rough use in a country where roads were very few and very bad and the wagon often went by no road at all. That Hesiod's wagon was a very simple affair is certain, whatever view we take of this passage, and when, elsewhere and for another purpose, he said that a hundred planks went to the making of it, he no doubt felt that the interests of morality would justify a departure from the strictest letter of the truth[2].

A. S. F. GOW.

xxiii. p. 146). There is in the Cabinet des Médailles a bronze chariot wheel 480 mm. in diameter (n. 1823), and others of about this size are figured by Lindenschmit, *Alterth. uns. heidn. Vorzeit* III. iv. 2.

[1] Cf. *Od.* vi. 69 *δμῶες ἐφοπλίσσουσιν ἀπήνην | ὑψηλὴν εὔκυκλον ὑπερτερίῃ ἀραρυῖαν.*

[2] For the sake of completeness I will mention here two views which I have not discussed in the text. The first is that of Schneider, who states (in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. "Αμαξα) that in *W. D.* 426, 453 *ἄμαξα* means 'plough.' For this assertion I can see no justification whatever. The second view is that of Tzetzes and some moderns that v. 427 refers to the wagon. There can, I think, be little doubt that the correct reading is *πόλλ' ἐπικαμπύλα κᾶλα*: 'curved timbers are common, but a good *γύης* takes some finding.'

CICERO'S COMMISSION AND MOVEMENTS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CIVIL WAR.

On his return from his province of Cilicia Cicero hoped for a triumph as a reward for some trifling military successes which he had gained there. Consequently he would not enter Rome, in order that he might not, by so doing, lose his *imperium*, but, proceeding leisurely from Brundisium, reached some place just outside the walls on Jan. 4th, 49 B.C. Caesar crossed the Rubicon nine days later and began the invasion of Italy. On Jan. 17th the Senate met and declared a *tumultus*. Pompey called on the magistrates and senators to leave Rome, which he thought it impossible to defend, and himself left the city that evening for Teanum Sidicinum, where a council of war was held on the 24th, attended by Pompey himself, both consuls, and Labienus who had now left Caesar.

But, earlier than the 17th, Italy was divided up into districts, for the purposes of recruiting and defence, each district being assigned to some prominent senator. The district assigned to Cicero, or chosen by him, was Capua. For on Jan. 12th Cicero wrote from near Rome to his freed-man Tiro, whom he had left ill at Patrae: *Italiae regiones discriptae sunt, quam quisque partem tueretur: nos Capuam sumpsimus* (*fam.* xvi 11, 3). A few days later he wrote to Atticus at Rome: *ego negotio praesum non turbulento: uult enim me Pompeius esse quem tota haec Campania et maritima ora habeat ἐπίσκοπον, ad quem delectus et summa negotii deferatur* (*Att.* vii. 11, 5). Editors of Cicero, and historians also, have supposed that two different commissions are here described: that Cicero, feeling his incompetence, put his resignation of the chief command at Capua into the hands of the Senate just before they left Rome, and that he was subsequently asked by Pompey to exercise a general supervision over the whole district of Campania and the coast.

To this view I feel that there are serious objections. First, is it likely that Cicero, immediately after refusing one commission, would accept another and a heavier, which included the district he had just resigned? Secondly, we shall see that Cicero, who is supposed to have resigned Capua, repeatedly visited Capua during February in an official capacity and sent at least one report about the recruiting there to Pompey.

I think it possible that Capua and Campania are used in these passages as synonyms. Capua was by far the most important city of the district; the inhabitants of Capua were regularly called *Campani*; the territory of Capua was known as *ager Campanus*. But I think it more probable that Cicero accepted an extension of his original charge of Capua. About the latter Atticus must have known, as the two friends were then meeting daily. So the fact that he announces to Atticus, about Jan. 20th, his task of supervising Campania and the coast, does, I think, point to an extension of the original commission.

But, in either case, I do not believe there was any definite resignation of the charge of Capua. I shall consider later the other passages from which it is commonly supposed that there was.

Cicero went straightway to Campania. His head-quarters were at Formiae in Latium, where he could enjoy the comforts of one of his largest villas; but he writes to Atticus at Rome from Cales, Capua, and other Campanian cities. On Jan. 25th Pompey left Teanum Sidicinum on his way to Luceria in Apulia, near which the only two legions under his command in Italy were billeted. His plan was to advance from there to Picenum which Caesar was now over-running—a plan which was frustrated partly by Caesar's activity, partly by the misconduct of Domitius, who was in command of the northern recruits at Corfinium. On Jan. 27th Cicero writes from Cales to Atticus (vii 14, 2) that he is on his way to Capua, at Pompey's wish, to assist in the recruiting (*me Pompeius Capuam uenire uoluit et adiuuare delectum*), it being intended that the recruits, when enrolled, should be transferred to Luceria to swell Pompey's army. On Jan. 29th Cicero wrote again to Tiro from Capua thus: *ego adhuc orae maritimae praesum a*

Formiis. nullum maius negotium suscipere uolui, quo plus apud illum (i.e. *Caesarem*) *meae litterae cohortationesque ad pacem ualerent* (*fam.* xvi 12, 5). It is impossible to reconcile this statement with what he says in a letter written to Atticus four days later. He says there (vii 17, 4) that he had written to Trebatius, in Caesar's camp, a statement intended for Caesar's eye, that he had undertaken no recruiting and no charge at all (*me neque delectum ullum neque negotium suscepisse*). The fact is, that it is not possible to rely on any single statement of Cicero's as to his position at this time, as he so often contradicts what he has previously said.

On Feb. 3rd Cicero started again from Formiae for Capua, according to the instructions of the consuls, whom Pompey had left behind him in the west of Italy. In his letter of Feb. 8th Cicero tells Atticus that the recruiting is a complete failure at Capua; and indeed it is little wonder that this was so, considering that he himself, who was (as we have seen) in charge of the recruiting, was plainly determined to do as little as possible, and already quite convinced that Pompey's enterprise was doomed to failure. From this time his letters to Atticus revolve round one point: 'if Pompey leaves Italy, shall I go with him?' Again and again he asks Atticus for his advice on this problem. Clearly his earnest wish was that Atticus should say 'don't go!': at least, when Atticus did give this advice, it is obvious that Cicero felt great relief, until Atticus unkindly changed his mind.

To Atticus Cicero says nothing further about the recruiting in Campania; but he sent a report from Formiae on Feb. 16th to Pompey at Luceria. Pompey had written to him on Feb. 10th, advising him to come to Luceria. Cicero replies, saying that he has remained at the post assigned to him (*in ea ora ubi praepositi sumus* viii 11 B 1), and has been carrying out the instructions of Pompey and the consuls. In strange contrast to what he has said repeatedly to Atticus, he represents the recruiting as going on busily at Capua, and speaks of the *uigilantia, auctoritas, industria* and *diligentia* of certain subordinate officers. He gives no hint to Pompey of any slackness on his own part or of anything amiss in the preparations. He

says that in his opinion the west coast ought not to be abandoned, but that, if Pompey wishes it, he will join him at Luceria. To this letter Pompey replied on Feb. 20th: he was then at Canusium, having left Luceria on his way to Brundisium, as he had determined after the fall of Corfinium to abandon Italy. He strongly urged Cicero to come to Brundisium as soon as possible. To this Cicero replied on the 27th in a letter (*Att.* viii 11 D) which Professor Conway calls "admirable" and Professor Tyrrell describes as "a document with which Cicero had every reason to be satisfied." I see it in a different light: it seems to me, in words of Cicero's own, *uerbosior quam uerior*, and I feel little doubt that in his heart he was completely dissatisfied with it from the first.

It contains more than one statement which can be absolutely disproved from the letters to Atticus. Thus (1) he says that on Feb. 16th he had not the faintest suspicion that Pompey would leave Italy: yet on Jan. 18th (vii 10, 1), and 23rd (vii 12, 4), and Feb. 10th (vii 23, 1) he had discussed this possibility fully with Atticus; in fact it was one of the first results of the outbreak of hostilities which he had foreseen. (2) He describes to Pompey an abortive attempt which he had made to go to Luceria. On Feb. 17th he started from Formiae with his son, brother, and nephew, and still attended by his lictors with the laurels on their *fasces*. When they had gone 30 miles, as far as Teanum Sidicinum, they heard a false and very improbable report that Caesar was on the march to Capua. The party then went off the Appian Way to Cales, intending to wait there till they could ascertain the truth of this report. At Cales (*cum Calibus essem*), Cicero says to Pompey, he received a copy of a despatch sent by Domitius to Pompey, with a postscript from Pompey which convinced Cicero and all his companions that Pompey had no intention of leaving Italy at all but was on the point of marching north to Corfinium. In that case, Cicero had no longer any reason to proceed to Luceria. Now a letter to Atticus (viii 6) written on Feb. 23rd from Formiae, shows that this statement is simply untrue: that Cicero had given up all idea of proceeding to Luceria and had returned to Formiae before he

ever saw this important despatch, which he represents as having had so much influence upon his movements. I cannot avoid the inference that he purposely misled Pompey on this point. He wished to conceal the fact that he had returned from Cales at once to Formiae; he wished to convey the impression that he had gone as far as was safe for him and had remained there until he discovered that it was quite useless for him to proceed to Luceria. As a matter of fact, he had done nothing of the kind. He goes on to say that he and his brother, on hearing of the disaster at Corfinium—he certainly implies that this news also reached them at Cales—were resolved to go on to Luceria and Brundisium, until they were warned by certain persons arriving from Samnium and Apulia that they were sure, if they did, to be caught by Caesar. Now, if they had been caught, Caesar's conduct at Corfinium might have proved to them that he would let them go as he had let go Domitius and all the officers whom he had taken there. But what chance was there that Caesar would catch them? The distance from Cales to Luceria is about 80 miles, the distance from Corfinium to Luceria about 130; and Cicero's party had the Appian Way to travel by. Caesar was now at the head of nearly 40,000 men; and even Cicero's laurelled lictors might have travelled faster than such an army.

Cicero thus returned to Formiae: from there he wrote twice to Atticus on Feb. 22nd; and there on Feb. 24th he heard of the fall of Corfinium; and there he remained associating with Servius Sulpicius, Volcatius Tullus, Aemilius Lepidus, and other consulars, who evidently formed a regular Cave of Adullam, cavilling against the unfortunate Pompey and his plan of campaign, and quite determined to welcome Caesar when he made his appearance at Rome. Cicero was not capable of the baseness of these men. There he remained till the very end of March when he moved to his house at Arpinum on purpose to celebrate in his native place the coming of age of his son. On the 28th of March at Formiae he had the famous interview with Caesar which he describes to Atticus (ix 18). Caesar had driven Pompey out of Italy on March 17th and was now returning to Rome where a meeting of the senate was summoned for

April 1st. He had an interview with Cicero by appointment and tried his utmost to induce Cicero to be present in the senate-house. To his lasting honour, Cicero refused. He writes to Atticus "I believe he is displeased with me; but I was pleased with myself, and it is long since that has happened to me." I feel convinced that he was not pleased with himself when he wrote his disingenuous letter of excuses to Pompey just a month earlier. Caesar went to Rome and held his meeting in the absence of Cicero, and a few days later started for Spain to fight the Pompeian army commanded by Afranius and Petreius. Cicero remained in Campania, chiefly at Formiae, until at last he screwed his courage to the sticking-place and sailed for Greece on June 3rd, at a time when it was generally believed in Italy that Caesar was getting the worst of it in Spain.

Why did Cicero not join Pompey earlier? He certainly could have done so, had he made the attempt in earnest; and that he felt he had done wrong in malingering is clearly shown by the bitter self-reproach which fills the letters written to Atticus after Pompey had actually left the soil of Italy. Obviously, he was very uncertain what to do and made very miserable by his uncertainty. On the one hand, he felt a strong personal obligation to Pompey who had helped in his restoration from exile; also he had a clear political conviction that Caesar was a law-breaker and a criminal with whom it was discreditable to have any dealings. On the other hand, he was personally attached to Caesar also; and many of his most intimate friends, especially the younger men among them, such as Caelius and Curio, were actively engaged in supporting Caesar. Also, he had a strong dislike for the typical Roman aristocrat, such men as Bibulus and Domitius: he disliked their stupidity and cruelty and, perhaps not less, their disrespectful treatment of himself as an upstart. But the motive to which he himself gives chief prominence later (*Att.* ix 10, 3) was probably the strongest of all: he was no longer young; he had just, to his great disgust, been absent from Rome for more than a year; and he felt it impossible to face the hardships of a second exile and a campaign. Livy described him truly when he called him *homo nihil minus quam ad bella natus.*

It remains to consider the other passages in the letters to Atticus which have led editors and historians to suppose that Cicero, having accepted a commission at Capua, resigned it within a few days—a conclusion from which I have stated my dissent.

The first passage occurs in the long letter of excuse and explanation written to Pompey on Feb. 27th. Cicero writes (viii 11 D 5) *quod tibi ostenderam cum a me Capuam reiciebam.* I believe that this means 'when I wished to refuse charge of Capua' and that it does not imply any formal resignation. (It may be noted that this interview cannot have been later than Jan. 17th, as Cicero never met Pompey again in Italy after that date.) The second passage occurs in a letter to Atticus written on Feb. 28th. He there says (viii 12, 2) *neque tum peccaui cum imparatam Capuam...accipere nolui,* where, if the emphasis lies on *imparatam,* the language does not necessarily imply a definite refusal. There is another important passage (viii 3, 4). Unfortunately the text is uncertain: the Teubner text runs *inuite cepi Capuam* (*in te cepi* MSS.: *interim cepi* Prof. Bywater: *lente cepi* Orelli: the word *inuite* is doubtful Latin):...*dixi ipsi me nihil suscepturum sine praesidio et sine pecunia* (cf. *imparatam* above)*; itaque nihil habui omnino negotii, quod ab initio uidi nihil quaeri praeter fugam.*

From these texts I come to the following conclusions: that Pompey, acting for the Senate, invited Cicero to supervise the recruiting and the interests of the party generally in Campania; that Cicero, having previously accepted the charge of Capua, accepted this charge also, at the same time pointing out that he wanted money and some soldiers to carry out his commission; that he went to his district but took no active part in the preparations going on there; and that six weeks later, when all was lost for Pompey in Italy, he found it possible to believe that the difficulties he had raised on accepting the commission amounted to a definite resignation of it.

J. D. DUFF.

SUETONIUS.

I.

The misdeeds of Lucius Caesar the younger: a forgotten episode of the Civil War.

1. In the 75th chapter of his life of Julius Caesar, Suetonius, when giving instances of the *clementia* shown by the conqueror to the conquered during the Civil War, says that only three Roman citizens, not actually in arms, were put to death, and even these against the wish of Caesar. The third of these victims was Lucius Caesar the younger; and Suetonius adds that the Dictator had special reasons for resentment in this case, because *L. Caesar, libertis seruisque eius ferro et igni crudelem in modum enectis, bestias quoque ad munus populi comparatas contrucidauerat.*

So far as I know, no editor of Suetonius or historian of Caesar has tried to elucidate these statements or to connect them, or to explain the circumstances in which the offences were committed. Yet one question must surely suggest itself to any reader familiar with the history of the time: 'where and when was it possible for a man so insignificant as Lucius Caesar to maltreat and murder the Dictator's servants?' And the curious reader will ask himself a further question: 'is there any connexion between the two incidents: the murder of the men and the slaughter of the animals?' The Latin does not suggest any connexion; but neither does it exclude it. To these two questions, which I have often put to myself in vain, I believe that I now see a satisfactory answer, which is given in the following paper.

2. We first hear of Lucius Caesar the younger at the very beginning of the Civil War. His father, who was distantly related to Julius Caesar, served as one of his *legati* in Gaul; and he himself was sent with instructions by Pompey to Caesar at Ariminum in January, 49 B.C., and brought back proposals for peace from the invader (*Bell. Ciu.* i 8). Cicero, who saw him at Minturnae on Jan. 25th, speaks of him to Atticus in contemptuous terms, and indeed describes him as *scopae solutae*, 'a broom with the binding off,' i.e. a feather-headed nincompoop (*ad Att.* vii 13 b 2). Whatever his qualifications or want of qualifications as an intermediary, he was sent back again to Caesar with further proposals. These came to nothing, and the war went on.

During the civil wars of the next three years there is reason to believe that Lucius Caesar bore a part on the side of the senate; for we are told by Dion Cassius (xliii 12) that he had made war continuously against his kinsman (*διαπαντὸς αὐτῷ προσπεπολεμήκει*). But he is mentioned only once in our accounts of the period: in the summer of 49 B.C., being in command of a small fleet on the African coast, he fled before Curio who was making a forcible landing in Africa (*Bell. Ciu.* ii·23). Whether he was present at Pharsalia, is not known. Finally, we hear of him in the spring of 46 at Utica, where he was serving under Cato and discharging the duties of quaestor. After the battle of Thapsus (April 6th, 46 B.C.) and the death of Cato, Lucius Caesar, as the chief Roman officer left in the place, advised the citizens to open their gates to the conqueror, and himself left the city to meet Caesar on his march (*Bell. Afric.* c. 88). When they met, he fell on his knees, begging his life and nothing but his life from his kinsman. The author of the *Bellum Africum* tells us (c. 89) that his request was at once granted; the other authorities, Suetonius and Dion, say that he was put to death later, but they differ somewhat as to the circumstances.

3. It is this last appearance of Lucius Caesar that throws light on the incidents alluded to by Suetonius; and from it I conclude that the answer to the questions asked above should be: (1) the offences were committed in Africa in 47

or 46 B.C.; (2) the two incidents were closely connected with one another.

4. We are told by all the authorities that in the summer of 46, some months after the battle of Thapsus, Caesar celebrated four triumphs and treated the populace of Rome to magnificent shows. These shows included beast-baitings (*uenationes*), which lasted for five days. On this occasion, we are told by Pliny, four hundred lions were destroyed for the amusement of the people, and the giraffe (*camelopardalis*) was seen for the first time in Europe; and these were only the crowning attractions of the show (Pliny *Nat. Hist.* viii 53 and 69). Africa had been from the time of Plautus[1], and still continued to be, the chief source upon which the Romans drew for their supply of wild beasts, which, for this reason, wherever they came from, were commonly called *africanae*: on this source mainly Caesar must have relied. To provide such a multitude of animals, a large number of separate expeditions must have been organised, and many separate consignments must have crossed the sea; and the difficulty of shipping them must have been great, considering that Scipio and Juba had much of the coast under their control. It is therefore certain that Caesar's agents were scouring the African deserts in pursuit of these animals for many months beforehand.

5. The letters written by M. Caelius Rufus at Rome to Cicero in Cilicia during the year 51 B.C. give us some idea of the methods employed by the Romans for this purpose. As aedile, Caelius had to give a show at Rome; and in nearly every letter he urges Cicero to provide him with panthers for the occasion. We see that Cicero, as governor of the province, had to issue an order to the natives, *Cibyratae* in this case, to organise a hunt for the animals; when secured, they were to be transferred to agents sent over by Caelius, whose business it was to feed and guard the animals and ship them across to Italy. See Cic. *ad fam.* viii 9, 3 *in hoc negotio nulla tua nisi loquendi cura est, hoc est imperandi et mandandi; nam simul atque erunt captae* (sc. *pantherae*), *qui alant eas et deportent.*

[1] Plaut. *Poenulus* 1011 *mures africanos praedicat in pompam ludis dare se uelle aedilibus.*

habes eos, quos ad Sittianam syngrapham misi. The previous letter (§ 10) shows that one of these agents was a freedman named Philo. We may fairly suppose that the methods employed by Caesar five years later, though on a far larger scale and in another continent, were similar as regards the employment, first, of native *uenatores* to catch and cage the animals, and, then, of *liberti* and *serui* to guard and export them.

6. These were the circumstances that gave Lucius Caesar his opportunity. It appears that some caravan of beasts, while making its way northwards to the sea, came dangerously near to Utica, and that Lucius Caesar used his military force to attack it. The freedmen and slaves in charge fought to defend their master's property; he was a good master, and they knew it. They lost their lives in this endeavour, and the beasts fell into the hands of Lucius Caesar.

7. What he did with them, cannot be precisely determined from the language of Suetonius. It may be that Suetonius chose the strong word *contrucidauerat* merely to express his pity for the untimely death of the animals, which, from the order of his narrative, he evidently considered a more unpardonable offence than the murder of the men who were in charge of them. On the whole, considering the tastes and habits of contemporary Romans, I am inclined to believe that Lucius Caesar would prefer to kill the animals, if he could, in such a way as to provide entertainment for spectators. Was this possible at Utica?

The remains of a large amphitheatre are still to be seen there; but the date of its construction is unknown, and it is unlikely that it was in existence at this time. Even at Rome, as the text of Suetonius (*Iul.* c. 39), if it were rightly punctuated, would prove, Caesar's lions were baited in the Circus, and there was no permanent amphitheatre until the Colosseum was opened by Titus in 80 A.D. But it is probable that, wherever gladiators could fight, wild beasts could also be baited, and that Utica had been brought up, in this respect, to the requirements of Roman civilisation. It seems possible, therefore, that these animals were not wasted but met their

fate in orthodox fashion before the eyes of Scipio, Juba, and other partisans of the Senate, whose enjoyment of the spectacle would be keener when they reflected that every beast they saw killed lessened the power of the detested Dictator to amuse the populace of Rome.

II.

The Art of Suetonius.

1. A careful study of part of the text of Suetonius has convinced me that some of what is said to his discredit in the current histories of Latin Literature is neither true nor just. In particular, I have no doubt that the established tradition under-estimates his skill as a literary artist. Of the common opinion to this effect I will give two examples out of many which might be quoted: Teuffel (§ 347 8) says without more ado: 'Suetonius' Lives are not works of art': and Madvig, whose words were never lightly written, describes him (*Aduersaria* II p. 570) as *scriptor, non ingenio aut arte, sed rebus, et materiae ad instituta cognoscenda copia, et scribendi simplicitate, commendabilis.* The first part of Madvig's criticism seems to me just: Suetonius is not notable for *ingenium*, for intellectual power; but the second I shall venture to dispute. I shall try to show, from the structure of one of the Lives, that Suetonius does possess *ars*, and that his *simplicitas* is by no means so unsophisticated as his critics have supposed. If they have failed to perceive his art, the reason may be that he has had the art to conceal it.

2. The Life of Julius Caesar begins with a concise narrative of his public career, first as the underground plotter and politician, later as the victorious general and autocratic ruler. This sketch comes to an end at c. 44, where Suetonius says of his last days: 'such were Caesar's occupations in the present and plans for the future, which were cut short by death. Before I speak of this, it will be relevant to set forth briefly particulars about his (1) *forma*, (2) *habitus*, (3) *cultus*, (4) *mores*, (5) *ciuilia studia*, (6) *bellica studia*.' He then proceeds to deal with these six points in order.

3. This is the regular method of Suetonius: he divides a topic into certain heads and then scrupulously follows the order he has laid down. To give one example out of many, he says at the beginning of this same chapter 44 that every day saw an extension of Caesar's plans *de ornanda instruendaque urbe, item de tuendo ampliandoque imperio.* He then gives details of (1) *ornatio Romae* by means of public buildings; (2) *instructio Romae* by means of public libraries and a code of law; (3) *tutela imperii* by means of vast engineering works in Italy and abroad; (4) *ampliatio imperii* by conquest of the Dacians and Parthians. His method, once perceived, is unmistakable; but it is frequently obscured by the wrong punctuation of all his editors.

4. His critics complain of his 'indifference to chronological exactness' (Teuffel § 347); and this is so far true that he does not often give precise dates. Thus, in c. 26, after summarising in a single sentence the nine years of fighting in Gaul, Germany, and Britain, he adds that *eodem temporis spatio* Caesar lost his mother, daughter, and grandchild; and then appends the next sentence, which chronicles the death of Clodius, with no more precise date than *inter quae.* Now these four persons did not all die at the same time, nor did they all take such an unconscionable time as nine years to die in. The date of Aurelia's death is not known, but from other sources we learn that Julia and her infant died in September 54, while Caesar was carrying on his second campaign in Britain; and that Clodius was killed on January 20, 52 B.C.

Yet, in fairness to Suetonius, we should set against this omission of dates his rigid adherence to chronological sequence in his narrative of events. The truth is that in attention to *ordo* he is precise even to pedantry, and that many of his chapters are written in the style of a Latin inscription, where conciseness and order are the two essential points—not at all a bad style, where the main object is to record a great number of facts in a small compass. This is the case even in trifles: when he tells us that Caesar did not ship his army over to Britain before he had reconnoitred *portus et nauigationem et accessum ad insulam* (c. 58), it is safe to infer, from the order

of words, that *portus* refers only to the harbours in Gaul: for these were naturally examined first, then the Channel crossing, and lastly the landing-places in Britain. So again, when we are told first of Caesar's election to the consulship, and then of the Triumvirate (c. 19), Mr Heitland rightly infers that Suetonius believed the election to have preceded the coalition: though the other authorities, and also the probabilities of the case, are against the biographer here.

5. I think it is not irrelevant to give here another instance of the kind of inference that can be drawn from this strict attention to order, either of date or fact, on the part of Suetonius. In c. 38 he enumerates the gifts made by Caesar in 46 B.C. to (1) his soldiers, (2) the populace of Rome. Among the latter he mentions a remission of rent for one year conceded to the poorer citizens. Considering the context, I conclude without doubt that, in the belief of Suetonius, Caesar paid the rent out of his own pocket. But historians do not accept this view: they hold that this measure was intended to satisfy in some degree the demand for *nouae tabulae* always urged by a section of the democratic party, and that the loss fell on the landlords. No doubt, the historians are right and Suetonius wrong; but, if he had shared their view, he would have inserted the fact in c. 42, where he described Caesar's legislation for the purpose of relieving debtors.

6. To return now to the narrative of Caesar's more personal and private life, Suetonius takes in order his *forma*, *habitus*, *cultus*, *mores*, *ciuilia studia*, and *bellica studia*. The last of the six topics is concluded in c. 70; and the reader expects that Suetonius, having now reached the end of his long digression, will proceed to redeem his promise and speak of Caesar's death.

But he does nothing of the kind: in c. 71 we find that he has gone back to *mores* which have already been treated of in cc. 49—54. In a writer so studious of order and arrangement, this cannot be a mere blunder; and attentive examination will show what the motive of Suetonius was.

Let us consider the contents of cc. 71 foll. The first topic is *studium et fides erga clientis* (Caesar's faithful devotion to

the interests of his dependants); this leads on by slight gradations through kindred topics to the most conspicuous and admirable feature in the *mores* of Caesar, namely his *clementia*. The order is this: Caesar was (1) faithful to his dependants (c. 71); (2) affectionate to his friends (c. 72); (3) forgiving to his private enemies (c. 73); (4) merciful to those whom he *did* punish (c. 74); (5) magnanimous in his treatment of those who took up arms against him. The fifth topic is the subject of the long 75th chapter: instance after instance is given, in strict order of time. The effect of the five chapters is cumulative; and the reader is left with the feeling, that a man so gentle and so magnanimous must have kept the devotion of his friends and gained that of his enemies, and that his life was perfectly secure against open or secret violence.

Then c. 76 begins with this sentence: *praegrauant tamen cetera facta dictaque eius, ut et abusus dominatione et iure caesus existimetur*. Two points deserve special attention here.

First, there is the position of the word *praegrauant*. In the five preceding chapters, Suetonius has been heaping up incident after incident to fill full the one scale, the scale of Caesar's merits; and now this single word, admirably chosen and admirably placed, tells us at once that there was another scale to the balance and that this was the heavier of the two.

The second point to notice is the word *caesus*. When he has written this word, Suetonius has made the connexion which unites the digression to the main narrative, and has started upon the story of Caesar's death.

Then, true to his regular method, he tells first of the offensive *facta* (c. 76) and then of the offensive *dicta* (c. 77), which brought on the fatal end. But here again we see the same principle at work, the principle by which he interrupts his order for the sake of dramatic effect. The list of *facta* and *dicta*, in this order, is followed by a pair of *facta* which had a decisive influence in bringing about the catastrophe: Caesar's disrespectful treatment of the Senate on one special occasion, and his violent resentment against two of the tribunes on another (cc. 78, 79). The adverse scale is now full to overflowing, and the narrative of the conspiracy follows quite

naturally. I believe that in the Life of Julius there is no third instance in which Suetonius, deliberately or otherwise, breaks the order which he has prescribed for himself.

For doing so after c. 70, he had two motives. First, he rightly considered the *clementia* of Caesar to be such a pre-eminent feature in his character that it ought not to come in casually together with such lesser matters as habits of eating and drinking; he therefore determined to give it emphasis by position. And, secondly, he saw that, by placing it where he does, he could make an excellent transition, at once dramatic and natural, to the final tragedy.

7. Work such as this is beyond all question artistic: it is worthy of any writer who ever used the Latin language, and even resembles in kind the supreme art which all recognise in the masterpieces of Attic tragedy. Yet Teuffel tells us that the Lives of Suetonius 'are not works of art.' If Teuffel's history survives to future ages, and Suetonius with it, I can imagine that commentators will treat this verdict much as they used to treat Cicero's famous sentence about Lucretius; but in this case they will propose, not to insert the word 'not,' but to omit it. Teuffel's own work is valuable for its learning and accuracy; but it shows clearly enough that he was not a specially competent judge of such a question. Yet Teuffel is a great authority; and his opinion has been adopted and repeated by critics who, if they had been willing to consider the evidence and judge for themselves, would have arrived at different and more just conclusions.

III.

The Rationalism of Suetonius.

1. Next, I wish to deal briefly with another statement of Teuffel's (§ 347, 6): 'Suetonius was preserved by his sober rationalism from the errors of the antiquarians of his time.' Do the facts justify this tribute to Suetonius?

2. So far as the life of Caesar is concerned, the exact contrary is the truth. With regard to the supernatural, there is a surprising contrast between his biography and the con-

temporary sources of our information, the letters of Cicero and the narrative of Caesar himself. There all is plain daylight, and there is nothing at all miraculous except Caesar himself and the speed with which he pushes on his armies: in this connexion, but in no other, Cicero uses the word τέρας (*ad Att.* viii 9, 4 *hoc τέρας horribili uigilantia, celeritate, diligentia est*). In Suetonius it is quite otherwise: we often find ourselves moving in an atmosphere of dreams and portents and divine apparitions. Thus, in c. 7 we are told of a portentous dream which Caesar dreamt in Spain. It is significant that this same dream is assigned by Plutarch (c. 32) to the night before the Rubicon was crossed; and Lucan too in his First Book seems to allude to something of the kind as happening then[1]. Next, we have in c. 81 a long list of *prodigia*, some utterly incredible and some very trivial, which were intended to warn Caesar of his coming death. And further, at two points in the narrative, Suetonius, though not willing to commit himself outright, implies that a god appeared on earth in visible form, to encourage Caesar or to do him honour.

The first of these appearances took place at the crossing of the Rubicon. He tells us (c. 32) that, while Caesar, on the bank of the river, still hesitated to take the irrevocable step, *quidam eximia magnitudine et forma in proximo sedens repente apparuit, harundine canens.* He goes on to say that the mysterious figure snatched a trumpet from one of the soldiers, blew a mighty blast upon it, and led the army across the river. Though he names no names, he clearly wishes us to understand that the god Pan, in visible form, was the leader of the host. We learn from Cicero (*de Diu.* i 101) that Latin mythology preserved legends of Faunus appearing in battles; and possibly the story of Pheidippides and his meeting with Pan in Arcadia (Herodotus vi 105) had something to do with this later legend; but Arcadia is one place and Italy another, and what was credible to the men of 490 B.C. is much more surprising when we are told that it occurred 450 years later. How it would startle the reader, if he came across such an incident in Cicero's Letters or the first book of Caesar's *Bellum Ciuile*!

[1] Lucan i 185—192.

The second divine apparition was at Caesar's funeral, where, after the crowd had been stirred 'to mutiny and rage' by the sight of the body and by Antony's speech, we are told (c. 84) that *repente duo quidam, gladiis succincti ac bina iacula gestantes, ardentibus cereis succenderunt* (sc. *lectum*). Here again no names are given; but the similarity of language (*repente*, *quidam*) shows that this incident is of the same nature as the last. Suetonius wishes to imply, though he will not say it in so many words, that the Twin Brethren, Castor and Pollux, made a visible appearance on earth, in order to do honour to Caesar.

3. There is some evidence to show that Suetonius himself was prone to credulity and superstition. His choice of authorities and his use of them do not give us a favourable idea of his critical powers. Further, a letter from Pliny to him (*Epp.* i 18) turns upon a dream which he had dreamt and which seemed to him to portend failure in a coming lawsuit.

It might also, I think, be argued, from the literature, *e.g.* from a general comparison between Cicero's correspondence and Pliny's, that superstition had more hold over the minds of educated Romans about 100 A.D. than it had 150 years earlier. What an absurd fuss Pliny makes (*Epp.* vii 27) about the hair of his freedman which was cut in the night by some mysterious and presumably supernatural hand, and how he tries to guess the danger against which this singular portent was meant to warn him! Can any incident, in the least like this, be produced from the whole correspondence of Cicero? That Cicero himself was entirely contemptuous of dreams and omens and supernatural appearances, and that he laughed at the whole business of the *auspex* and *haruspex*, we learn clearly enough from the second book of his treatise on divination.

4. I conclude then that Teuffel, who was wrong in denying art to Suetonius, is also wrong in attributing to him a 'sober rationalism.'

J. D. DUFF.

NOTES ON THE RHETORIC OF ARISTOTLE.

As basis of the following remarks and suggestions I took Roemer's first Teubner text (1885), consulting also his second edition, the editions of Spengel and Cope, and other books.

1355 b 18 foll. As the second and third *κατὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν* refer to the honesty or dishonesty of the person concerned, the first should mean the same thing. But in that case we should have to understand *ῥήτωρ* in a bad sense, not *rhetorician* but *unscrupulous speaker*, and for this there is no authority. The word does not appear ever to imply any distinct censure, unless like Plato you are quarrelling with a man for being a habitual speaker at all. There is nothing in it that points to any particular quality of speech. If on the other hand *ὁ δὲ κατὰ προαίρεσιν ῥήτωρ* is not taken in this way, it is hard to give it any meaning, and the first *ὁ μέν* and *ὁ δέ* do not correspond with the second. Editors and translators do not give much help here.

ib. 25. Read *ἔστω δὴ <ἡ> ῥητορικη.*

1358 a 8. It may be right to omit *τοὺς ἀκροατάς*, but *λανθάνουσίν τε καί...μεταβαίνουσιν* is not in Greek = *λανθάνουσι μεταβαίνοντες*.

ib. 19 *ἔσται*, as in the next line, seems probable, or else *ἔστι* there.

1360 a 13 *καὶ τίνων τ' ἐξαγωγῆς δέονται καὶ τίνων εἰσαγωγῆς, ἵνα πρὸς τούτους κ.τ.λ.*

'Standing in need' of the export of certain things, though a possible, is certainly a rather odd expression. Should not *ἐξαγωγῆς* and *εἰσαγωγῆς* change places so as to soften it?

τούτους stands loosely for 'the people who send or take these things,' just as for instance in Soph. *Ant.* 668 *τοῦτον τὸν ἄνδρα* is 'the man who does this.' Nothing seems to be lost.

1364 a 25 *χαλεπωτέρα*? Aristotle is however careless on this point: cf. 1411 a 18, *Eth.* 3. 5. 1114 a 4.

1364 b 34. Probably *ὡς ἂν ἓν τῶν συστοίχων.* [*ὡς ἕν* Kayser.]

1366 b 30 *τὰ δίκαια καὶ τὰ δικαίως ἔργα.*

The use of the adverb is very unusual, but such examples as the following seem to justify it: Dem(?) 10. 44 *τὴν κρύβδην ψῆφον* and *τοῦ φανερῶς θορύβου* with Xen. *Hell.* 7. 3. 7 *τῶν φανερῶς προδοτῶν*: Dem. 29. 14 *τὸν ὁμολογουμένως δοῦλον* with Xen. *Hell.* 2. 3. 38: Plato *Phaedo* 109 E *ὁ ἀληθῶς οὐρανός*, Antiphanes *Fragm.* 209 *τὴν ἀληθῶς μουσικήν*, Dem. 21. 149 *ἢ ὡς ἀληθῶς μήτηρ*: Plato *Rep.* 341 C *ὁ ὀρθῶς κυβερνήτης*: Philodemus *π. κακιῶν* col. 19. 40 *τὴν κοινῶς σύνεσιν*: and some less notable instances, especially of *ἄγαν* and *λίαν*.

1368 b 11. The passage would run more naturally, if we read *εἰδότες* for *ἑκόντες*, corresponding to *εἰδότες* before and after.

In *Met.* 4. 30 1025 a 9 *ἑκόντα* and *εἰδότα* are variants. Cf. however *Eth.* 3. 2. 1111 b 7 and 1112 a 14.

ib. 15 *γε* for *δέ*? Better perhaps omitted.

1369 b 5 *βίᾳ δὲ ὅσα παρ' ἐπιθυμίαν ἢ τοὺς λογισμοὺς γίγνεται δι' αὐτῶν τῶν πραττόντων.*

Not only logic but parallel passages point clearly to <*μὴ*> *δι' αὐτῶν*. See 1368 b 34 and 36 *μὴ δι' αὐτούς*: *Eth.* 3. 1. 1110 a 1 *βίαιον δὲ οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἔξωθεν, τοιαύτη οὖσα ἐν ᾗ μηδὲν συμβάλλεται ὁ πράττων ἢ ὁ πάσχων* with 1110 b 2 and 16. The *βίαιον* proper is not done in the true sense (sometimes not in any sense) by the man himself, but by some other man or men or some natural agency, e.g. wind.

1371 b 18 *τὸ ὅμοιον καὶ τὸ συγγενὲς ἡδὺ ἑαυτῷ ἅπαν.*

ἑαυτῷ should follow *συγγενές* or *ὅμοιον*.

1372 a 32 *οἷς ὑπάρχει κρύψις ἢ τρόποις ἢ τόποις ἢ διαθέσεις εὔποροι.*

For *τρόποις*, of which it is hard to make any sense, read *χρόνοις*. Cf. 1402 b 37. In *Pol.* 2. 2. 1261 a 34 I would read *τρόπον* for *χρόνον*, and in D. Hal. *A. R.* 4. 7. 3 *χρόνοι* for *τόποι*. MSS. show the confusion by various readings.

Should not *διαθέσεις*(*-ις*) *εὔποροι*(*-ος*) be datives too, *διαθέσεσιν εὐπόροις*?

ib. 36. Read *ἔχει* for *ἕξει*.

1372 b 29 *πάντας* should (I think) be *αὐτούς*. See my *Aristophanes and Others*, p. 174.

1373 b 7. Perhaps *ἔστι γὰρ ὅτι μαντεύονται πάντες*.

Just below *ὅτι δίκαιον* and *δίκαιον* after *τοῦτο* are awkward together. Perhaps one, preferably *ὅτι δίκαιον*, should be omitted.

ib. 30 *ἀνάγκη τὸν ἀδικούμενον βλάπτεσθαι καὶ ἀκουσίως βλάπτεσθαι.*

ὑπὸ ἑκόντος in 28 and *τὰ ἑκούσια* in 32 make it quite clear that we should read *ἑκουσίως*. In the *Ethics* not 1136 a 15 foll., but 1135 a 17 foll. is the corresponding passage.

1374 a 10. The difficulty of the accusative *πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα* suggests omitting *ἡ* (after *ν*, N and H) before *ἀμφισβήτησις*. *π. τ. τ.* is then nominative and subject.

1375 a 5 *οἷον ἐν Ἄργει ζημιοῦται δι' ὃν ἂν νόμος τεθῇ καὶ δι' οὓς τὸ δεσμωτήριον ᾠκοδομήθη.*

I conjecture that after *καί* there has been lost *ἐν* with the name of another place. *ἐζημιώθησαν* can be understood more easily so.

1377 a 17 *κρεῖττον γὰρ ἄν* is not good Greek without *ἦν* or *εἴη*. Either add one of them or read *δή* for *ἄν*, if *ἄν* is not with most MSS. to be simply omitted.

ib. 20. Prof. Bywater suggests *τἀσεβεῖ* for scansion's sake. I had already proposed *δυσσεβεῖ* (*δυσ- εὐ- ἀ-*): see *A. and Others*, p. 299.

1377 b 20. Some difficulty has been felt about the words *ὡς...λόγων*. I think *ὡς* should be *ὥστε*, *τε* having been lost before *περί*.

1378 a 5. Read ἤ (or, as Mr Bywater suggests to me, ἢ καί) for καί. The same man is not both ἀπαθής and δυσχεραίνων. Cf. on 1399 b 15 and 1407 b 20.

ib. 31. If φαινομένης is not to be omitted (Spengel), it would seem to have been substituted for some other word by reason of φαινομένην immediately following. The original might be γινομένη, as in b 8.

1378 b 27 αὐτούς has nothing to refer to. We might think of αὐτοί, or of ἄλλους.

1379 b 9 καταφρονεῖν...οἱ μὲν ὡς ἡττόνων, οἱ δὲ ὡς παρ' ἡττόνων.

The antithesis does not seem really better than that quoted from Epicharmus in 1410 b 5.

1380 b 14 ἐὰν ἐλεῶσιν is very poor, and ἐὰν ἕλωσιν makes no proper sense at all. Is ἐῶσιν possible? We might read either καὶ ἐῶσιν, ἐάν...ἔδρασαν or καί, ἐάν...ἔδρασαν, ἐῶσιν.

1381 a 13. If τοιούτοις is to refer to μεγάλα, as it seems to do (cf. 1385 a 20), the one clause should follow immediately on the other, *i.e.* ἢ εἰ προθύμως either precede ἢ εἰ μεγάλα or follow ἤ...καιροῖς.

ib. 39. Scholars do not seem to have noticed the very unusual grammar of ἃ μάλιστα φοβοῦνται μὴ ὑπάρχειν αὐτοῖς (for μὴ οὐχ ὑπάρχει or -ῃ).

1382 a 17 foll. ὄντας ἀποδεικνύναι shows that in μὴ ὄντας ποιεῖν the ποιεῖν must mean *represent them as*. φάσκοντας διαλύειν seems impossible, for διαλύειν *refute* cannot take an accusative of the person, but only of the statement or argument refuted. φασκόντων, the genitive absolute, *if people say either*, seems likely. Again—in spite of some translations—δι' ὀργὴν ἢ δι' ἔχθραν ἀμφισβητεῖν is not likely to mean 'dispute whether it is due to anger or to enmity' (though this is just possible), until πότερον or an equivalent has been inserted before δι' ὀργήν.

1382 b 32 ἄν must be added to the second παθεῖν, or παθεῖν omitted.

1383 a 18. Is ὡς lost after the ων of φοβερῶν?

ib. 19—20. It is clearly ludicrous to say θαρραλέα...τὰ θαρραλέα. There is slight evidence for τὰ σωτήρια and Spengel was certainly right in wishing to read it (or τὰ ἐναντία). τῶν σωτηρίων ὡς ἐγγὺς ὄντων comes just before. I notice this because it is a very obvious case of the substitution of one word for another. A little below in 1383 b 21 ἀδικῆσαι seems to me to be clearly due to ἀδικίας and to have taken the place of some other word, say πλεονεκτῆσαι.

1383 b 29. The αἰτεῖν in ἀπαιτεῖν ὅτε αἰτεῖν cannot be right. If it is an error like those just indicated, it may represent a word quite unlike itself. ἀπιστεῖν however occurs to me as giving fair sense. The man will not ask for repayment, when asking may seem to imply apprehension and doubt of the other man's purpose or power to repay.

ἐπαινεῖν ἵνα δόξῃ αἰτεῖν has been ingeniously emended by Bywater to ἐπαινεῖν ἃ δόξει αἰτεῖν. I have myself thought of ἵνα <μὴ> δόξῃ. Cf. on 1369 b 5.

1384 a 5 πάντα is probably an accidental repetition from the line before.

1384 b 6 οὐδὲν γὰρ διαφέρει μὴ δοκεῖν ἢ μὴ ἐξαγγέλλειν.

μὴ δοκεῖν makes no sense. Bonitz μὴ ἰδεῖν. Perhaps οὐδὲν γὰρ διαφέρειν δοκεῖ μὴ εἰδέναι (cf. 1381 b 7) ἢ μὴ ἐξαγγέλλειν.

ib. 31. Sauppe's ἧς is almost certainly right, ὧν being another case of repetition (1383 a 20).

1385 a 19. If ᾗ is right, there remains no construction for the nominatives μόνος, etc. Perhaps it is a dittograph of ν (H N: cf. on 1374 a 10) or should be ἤ. Indeed ᾗ hardly seems right in itself, for we should rather expect γίνηται. One would not say ὑπουργία ἐστὶ σφόδρα δεομένῳ. [Mr Bywater suggests to me δεόμενος.]

1386 a 3 ἐλπίσαι γενέσθαι is almost certainly bad Greek. We want <ἂν> γενέσθαι or γενήσεσθαι, and probably should restore the latter.

ib. 13 <κακῶς> πεπονθότος? If πεπονθότος stood alone, it

would have to refer to the case or cases just mentioned, which is not at all the meaning.

1387 a 28 *τι* for *τό*? Cf. on 1402 a 12.

1387 b 10 *καὶ μάλιστα <ἐάν>*? *μάλιστ' ἄν* would be easier still.

1388 b 10 *οἰκεῖα γὰρ οἴονται αὐτοῖς εἶναι καὶ ἄξιοι τούτων.* Should not *εἶναι* precede or follow *ἄξιοι*? 1379 a 3 has, if the text is right, *ἄξιος οἰόμενος* without *εἶναι*, but here the preceding clause makes *καὶ ἀ. τ.* particularly awkward.

ib. 30. For *αὐτῶν* write *τούτων* or possibly *πάντων* (cf. on 1372 b 29).

1389 b 18 *ἧττόν τε ἄγαν ἅπαντα ἢ δεῖ.*

In spite of *πάντα ἄγαν πράττουσιν* and *τοῦ πάντα ἄγαν* these words are very questionable. Is *ἄγαν* ever used with a comparative? We can say in English *excessively little*, but not *excessively less*: so probably in Greek. *πολύ* or *πολλῷ ἧττον* would be natural. In any case *ἄγαν* is superfluous. Again *πάντα ἄγαν πράττουσιν* is too far away to supply a verb easily. Thirdly it is not true that old men *ἧττον* (*πράττουσιν*) *ἅπαντα ἢ δεῖ*, for Aristotle goes on to say that they are too suspicious and too self-regarding (*φίλαυτοι μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ*). The obvious *ἄγανται* (Zeller, Rassow) is not a good suggestion, *ἄγαμαι* being unsuitable; but *ἀγαπῶσιν* would be quite in place, going well with *τὰ πλεῖστα φαῦλα εἶναι.* In Plut. *Mor.* 401 F *τιμᾶν καὶ ἀγαπᾶν* is a pretty certain correction of *τιμᾶν καὶ ἄγαν*, and in Isocrates 15. 232 *ἄγασθαι* is an erroneous *v. l.* for *ἀγαπᾶσθαι.*

1390 a 26 *ἀποδέχονται πάντες τοὺς τῷ σφετέρῳ ἤθει λεγομένους λόγους.*

The phrase is an odd one and it is not surprising that *ὁμολογουμένους* has been suggested (Cope). But Plato *Gorg.* 513 B has *τῷ αὑτῶν ἤθει λεγομένων τῶν λόγων ἕκαστοι χαίρουσι* (where I have myself suggested *ὁμολογουμένων*). The commentators on neither place seem aware of the other.

1390 b 7 *διήρηνται*?

1392 b 8. Should we read in Agathon *τῆς τέχνης πράσσειν*, *it belongs to art to do*?

1393 b 18 *συνομολογήσας*, altered because of the other genitive? The two participial genitives, referring to different unexpressed subjects, are very clumsy, and the first is not in strictness grammatical, though it might stand (Vahlen on *Poetics* 1449 a 9).

1394 b 33 <*ὡς*> *στρογγυλώτατα*?

1395 a 23. The tense of *εἰρημένη ᾖ* is not consistent with *δεῖ τὰς γνώμας λέγειν*, which supposes the *γνώμη* not yet uttered. We might think either of *παθητικῶς εἰρημένη ἡ γνώμη, i.e. μέλλῃ φαίνεσθαι*, or *παθητικὴ εἰρημένη* (omitting *ᾖ*).

1395 b 11. There is authority for *πῶς τυγχάνουσι ποῖα* and for *ποῖα τυγχάνουσι* without any *πῶς*. If both words were used, *ποῖα τυγχάνουσι πῶς* is perhaps the more natural order.

1398 a 7 *σὺ μὲν* <*οὖν*> *ὤν*?

In 10 *ἄν* seems a mistake due to the line before. In 9 we should expect *οἷον* before the second *εἰ*.

1399 a 13 *κακὸν* <*ὄν*>?

1399 b 15 *ἤ* should be *καί*. *ἤ* cannot follow on *ταὐτό*.

1400 a 6. Read *γενέσθαι*, as a past sense is clearly needed.

1400 b 21 *ἦσαν* for *ἄν*? But it may well be a dittograph from *ἀν-θρώπου*.

1402 a 6 *ὅτι ἐστὶ τὸ μὴ ὂν ὄν, ἐστὶ γὰρ τὸ μὴ ὂν μὴ ὄν*.

The argument points rather to *ἔστι τὸ μὴ ὄν* in the first clause, omitting there the second *ὄν*.

ib. 12 *γίγνεται γάρ τι* (for *τό*)? Cf. on 1387 a 28.

ib. 18. The grammar is defective. *μὴ ἔνοχος ὤν*, as in 19, or *οἷον* <*ἂν*> *ἀσθενής...φεύγῃ* seems needed.

1402 b 16. I suggest *δι' ἐπαγωγῆς ἐκ* (for *διὰ*) *τοῦ ὁμοίου*. The use of *διά* is doubtful: for *ἐκ* cf. 15.

1404 b 2 *σημεῖον γὰρ ὅτι ὁ λόγος, ὡς ἐὰν μὴ δηλοῖ, οὐ ποιήσει τὸ ἑαυτῆς ἔργον*.

ὅτι may be a mistake for *ἐστίν* and *ὡς* for *ὥστε* (or *καί*): we must not make *ὡς* itself = *ὥστε* (Madvig). Or we might think of *σημεῖον γάρ τι ὁ λόγος ὤν, ἐὰν κ.τ.λ.* Apart from any other

objection, *σημεῖον ὅτι* seems here superfluous, if not odd. *ὁ γὰρ λόγος* is what one would expect.

ib. 14. *πολλῷ ἐλάττοσιν <χρῶνται>?*

ib. 36. Read *ἐνδέξεται*, matching *ἔσται* and *σαφηνιεῖ*.

1405 a 34—36. Both *ταῖς ἀσήμοις φωναῖς* and *τὰ ἀνώνυμα* lack construction. The former cannot well be either instrumental or causal. Perhaps some such word as *χρωμένη* or *εἰκάζουσα* has been lost. Before *τὰ ἀνώνυμα* Mr Bywater would insert *ἐπί*. I had thought of *λέγουσα* or *προσαγορεύουσα*.

1406 b 16 *ἄριστα τῶν τραγικῶν <ἔχει>* or *<εἶχεν>*, lost before *εἶπε*. The verb can hardly be dispensed with. *Theaet.* 148 B *ἄριστά γ' ἀνθρώπων, ὦ παῖδες* is not parallel, for it is an exclamation. One could not well say *τὸ Γοργίου εὖ* or *καλῶς* without *ἔχει*, though one might say *εὖ Γοργίας (i.e. εἶπε)*. Cf. however *Eth.* 10. 9 b 8 *κρῖναι τί καλῶς*, if right.

1407 b 16. Surely *ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ αὐτῇ*. *αὐτοῦ* is unmeaning.

1407 b 20 *ἢ ψόφον ἢ χρῶμα.*

Both *ἤ* and the accusative cases are strange. The *ἤ* should probably be *καί*. *ψόφῳ* and *χρώματι* are obvious to suggest, but the sentence may be otherwise wrong. The accusatives are not the subject or object of *ἀποδιδόναι*, for that refers to the verb which should suit both of them.

1408 a 9. In *Aristophanes and Others*, p. 299, I have suggested *ἰέναι* for *εἶναι.*

ib. 26 *ἡ ἐκ τῶν σημείων δεῖξις.*

The context and especially lines 10—11, 16, 20 point to *λέξις*, nor do *ἀκολουθεῖ* and *ἁρμόττουσα* go very well with *δεῖξις*. *ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων* Teichmueller; if *σημείων* is wrong, perhaps *ὁμοίων*.

1410 a 27 *<ἡ> ἀρχή* or *<ἐν> ἀρχῇ*?

1411 a 16. Should not *ὀνομάσας—ἐπιεικῶν* follow *Μοιροκλῆς*? As it stands, *πονηρότερος* has nothing to refer to.

1411 b 10. The bronze figure is spoken of as *τὸ ἄψυχον δὴ ἔμψυχον*. Surely it should be the reverse, *τὸ ἔμψυχον δὴ*

ἄψυχον. The lifeless bronze has taken to itself life. *τὸ ἄψυχον ἔμψυχον* would rather be a living creature that looked lifeless.

I suggest further that *τὸ ἔμψυχον...ἔργων,* which is manifestly part of the quotation, should follow immediately upon *τὴν εἰκόνα τὴν χαλκῆν,* to which it stands in apposition.

1412 b 21 *ὅσῳ ἂν <ἐν> ἐλάττονι.*

ib. 24, 25 *ὀρθῶς* is too vague and *τὸ πρὸς ὃν λέγεται* has no bearing on the context. *Haec...me non intelligere ingenue fateor* (Spengel).

1413 a 19 *καὶ <αἱ> εὐδοκιμοῦσαι.*

ib. 21 *ἀλλὰ τὸ <κάλαθον> πολὺ σφόδρα?*

1413 b 1 *διό...ἀπρεπές* should precede *χρῶνται...ῥήτορες,* if indeed it should not stand further back still after *μειρακιώδεις.* Perhaps *ἀπρεπεῖς.*

ib. 8 *ἔστι δὲ λέξις γραφικὴ μὲν ἡ ἀκριβεστάτη κ.τ.λ.*

Cope, Jebb (in his early translation), Welldon, render this as though it were *ἡ γραφικὴ ἀκριβεστάτη* and *ἡ ἀγων. ὑποκρ.* I do not feel at all sure that that is not the meaning; but, if so, the text must be altered in some way, *e.g. ἀκριβεστάτη μὲν ἡ γραφική* and so on.

ib. 15. Has *λόγοι* been lost?

1415 a 20. No doubt *ἐν τῷ προλόγῳ* wants moving (Spengel) into the first clause, but I doubt whether *ἀλλά γέ που* would be good Greek by itself. *ἀλλὰ <ὕστερόν>* or *<ἀλλαχοῦ> γέ που?*

1416 a 12. The inappropriate *ἀδικοῦντα* looks like a repetition (from *ἀδικεῖν*) like those mentioned above on 1383 a 20.

ib. 24 *εἰ καθάριος ὁ <δεῖνα>, μοιχός* (*Aristophanes and Others,* p. 299 = this *Journal* 13. 99).

1417 a 31 *τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἂν γενέσθαι ἀπολόμενα.*

Surely *ἀπολομένων.* It is not that the lost might return, but that there might come others, if the first were lost. In the actual lines, Sophoclean or not, of the *Antigone* there is a

similar genitive with the subject to be supplied, *πόσις γὰρ ἄν μοι κατθανόντος ἄλλος ἦν*, and Aristotle is only substituting the prose word *ἀπολομένων* for the poetical *κατθανόντος*.

1417 b 9 *ὁρᾶν* <*ἔστιν*>? We cannot very well carry on the *ἔστιν* of 4.

ib. 35 *ὡς ἔσται μὲν* <*ποιοῦσιν*> *ἃ κελεύει*? The subject of *ἔσται* is the end desired, *ἃ κελεύει* are the means to it.

ib. 17. The sense is very obscure, but *λέγειν* and *διατάττειν* ought probably to be futures dependent on *ὑπισχνεῖσθαι*.

1418 a 36 *εἰ γὰρ Ἀχιλλέα λέγει* (or *λέγων* <*τυγχάνει*>), *Ηηλέα ἐπαινεῖν*. The infinitive is obviously necessary.

1419 a 25. Read *συμπεραινομένου*.

H. RICHARDS.

ΛΟΓΟΣ AND ΜΕΣΟΤΗΣ IN THE *DE ANIMA* OF ARISTOTLE.

In the *De Anima*, sense or sensation is said by Aristotle (though never in one and the same sentence) to be both a λόγος and a μεσότης. The reasons for calling it a λόγος are explained by him in the following passage (424 a, 17 ff.):

> "*Sense* (αἴσθησις) is that which is receptive of perceived forms (εἰδῶν) apart from their matter, as the wax takes the form but not the matter of the seal. Each sense is affected by that which possesses the appropriate character (colour, sound, etc.), but by it not as a particular thing, rather as exhibiting a character, i.e. in respect of the form (ᾗ τοιονδὶ καὶ κατὰ τὸν λόγον). *Sense-organ* in the primary use stands for that in which such a power resides. These (i.e. organ and power) are the same, but their being is different. Otherwise we should have to say that that which perceives was an extended thing (μέγεθος), whereas in fact sensitivity or sensation is not an extended thing, but a form (λόγος) or potency of it[1].
>
> "This makes evident the explanation of the fact that sensuous qualities in excess destroy the organ. For if the movement is too strong for the organ, the form (which is, as we saw, the sensation) is destroyed—λύεται ὁ λόγος (τοῦτο δ' ἦν ἡ αἴσθησις)—just as concord and tone vanish when the strings are struck too hard. It also explains why

[1] ἀλλὰ λόγος τις καὶ δύναμις ἐκείνου. These words are variously interpreted according to the supposed reference of ἐκείνου to (1) μέγεθος, or (2) τὸ αἰσθητόν, or (3) τὸ αἰσθανόμενον, which last may be taken to mean (*a*) the sense organ, or (*b*) the percipient soul. I offer a suggestion on the subject below, p. 192.

plants do not possess sensation, though they possess a portion of soul and though the tangible qualities do themselves exercise an effect on them—for they are cooled and warmed. The reason is that they do not possess a mediety or a principle adapted to receive the forms of objects of sense: and are affected by these forms only as conjoined with matter."

In another passage (426 a, 27) another reason is given for calling sensation a λόγος, together with a repetition of the inference from excessive stimulus. The first sentence is a subject of lively controversy and clearly was so in ancient times.

"If concord is a species of sound, and sound and hearing are in a sense one and the same, and concord is a λόγος, then hearing must needs be a form of λόγος. That is why any sound in excess is destructive of hearing, high and low alike. It is the same with sight (light and dark) and smell (sweet and bitter)—which shows that sensation is a λόγος. Such qualities are indeed pleasant when in a pure and unmixed form they are brought into the λόγος (ἄγηται εἰς τὸν λ.), but in general the mixture or concord of high and low is pleasanter than either by itself. The sensation is the λόγος; and in excess the qualities produce pain (λυπεῖ—λύει Byw. after Soph. and Prisc.) or destruction."

This passage appears to imply the doctrine that the perceived *character* is always a λόγος, i.e. (as afterwards explained) a judicious mixture of the opposed qualities of high and low, light and dark, sweet and bitter; and, on the assumption that sensation in actuality is characterized identically with the object, to infer that sensation is a λόγος. But it goes on to say that the perceived character may be simple, not composite; from which it would appear to follow that sensation in actuality is not always a λόγος—and the remarks about the superior pleasantness of a mixture seem to be intended to remove this difficulty by suggesting that the proper object of sensation is that which gives the superior pleasure. The argument is not convincing and seems hardly to accord with that of the earlier passage.

For corroboration here again Aristotle turns to the fact that excessive stimulation pains or destroys the organ ; and it might be asked 'what has that to do with the matter?' As far as I can see, the fact can only be held to be relevant in this connexion, if Aristotle is supposed to include under the head 'mixture in the object' two quite different facts. The *first* and more obvious case of mixture is that in which two sounds occur simultaneously—what we may call concord proper—and this is distinguished from the single notes, the εἰλικρινῆ καὶ ἀμιγῆ, as we should expect. The simultaneous sounds (e.g. of a chord) are heard as one, and the effect is more pleasant than that produced by a single note. But *secondly* the single note may itself be held to be a mixture of the ἐναντία high and low : as it diverges from the perceptual centre it becomes less and less of a mixture, more and more mere high or mere low : and a point is reached in each direction in which it practically ceases to be a mixture at all. It is then in excess, and pains or destroys the organ. Thus a single note is after all a συμφωνία or λόγος (since all sound is a mixture of high and low), and hearing is proved to be always and not merely sometimes a λόγος. In this fashion it is possible to make fair sense of the passage just quoted.

Whatever may be the solution of the difficulties which the passage contains it seems plain that the ground given for calling sensation a λόγος is the fact that the perception is a λόγος, and hardly less plain that λόγος has to be interpreted as the ratio of components or formula of combination. Of the earlier passage neither of these assertions seems to be obviously true. There the word λόγος is only once used in connexion with the *object*, viz. where Aristotle says that the object perceived is active in sensation ᾗ τοιονδὶ καὶ κατὰ τὸν λόγον; and here λόγος seems to be the equivalent of the εἶδος αἰσθητόν which, apart from its matter, sensation is said to 'receive.' In the earlier passage, again, the corroboration from excessive stimulus does not appear to refer to any ratio of components in the object as a condition of effective sensation, nor is it any such ratio which is annulled by the excess. The words λύεται ὁ λόγος· τοῦτο δ' ἦν ἡ αἴσθησις, state definitely

that the λόγος which is destroyed *is* sensation; and that λόγος (it might be urged) cannot be identical with a λόγος in the object, since the stimulus is strong enough to defeat apprehension[1]; i.e. sense in actuality has not occurred, and what has not come into being cannot be destroyed. There are further difficulties in the passage; but these must be put aside for the moment while we consider the assertion that sensation is a *μεσότης*.

Of the special senses it is only in regard to touch that Aristotle gives any detailed account of the reason for regarding it as a *μεσότης* (423 b, 27 ff.). By touch, he says, we apprehend the fundamental qualities of body—warm, cold, dry, moist; and the organ of touch is something potentially so qualified - i.e. potentially warm, dry, etc. In sensation it is so acted on as to become in actuality what formerly it was in potentiality and what its object is in actuality. "For this reason," he says, "we do not perceive what is equally warm or cold or hard or soft with ourselves, but only superior degrees of these qualities (*τῶν ὑπερβολῶν*); and this shows that sensation is a kind of mediety in relation to certain contrary oppositions of qualities in its objects—*ὡς τῆς αἰσθήσεως οἷον μεσότητός τινος οὔσης τῆς ἐν τοῖς αἰσθητοῖς ἐναντιώσεως.*" "It is this fact," he continues, "which makes possible sense-discrimination. *τὸ γὰρ μέσον κριτικόν*—the *medium* is discriminative, since in face of each extreme (*ἄκρον*) it takes on the character of the other. Just as, if a thing is to perceive white and black, it must not be either of these in actuality, but must be potentially both—and the like would hold of any other sense—so with touch, it must be neither warm nor cold...."

In another passage Aristotle uses the fact that touch is a *μεσότης* to show that the animal body cannot be composed of a single element (435 a, 11). Without touch, he has proved, no other sense is possible: and the organ of touch cannot be composed of a single element. If it were composed of earth,

[1] It may be and has been thought that this implies as a condition of *αἴσθησις* a proper relation between the strength of the stimulus and the capacity of the organ, rather than between elements compounded either in the organ or in the object.

he now seems to argue, it would enable us to apprehend only the qualities distinctive of earth (*ὅσαι διαφοραὶ γῆς εἰσίν*), whereas in fact touch is a sort of mediety throughout the whole range of the tangible: *πάντων ἡ ἁφὴ τῶν ἁπτῶν ἐστὶν ὥσπερ μεσότης*. He adds that it is precisely the fact that they are composed of earth that makes the hair of man and certain other parts, as well as all plants, insensible. The last statement consorts oddly with the view implied in the preceding sentence that a sense whose organ was composed of earth would perceive the qualities proper to earth; and we can only suppose that the earlier statement is an *ad hominem* argument against a supporter of the *ὅμοιον ὁμοίῳ* doctrine. Yet if this supposition is made the Aristotelian doctrine seems to disperse in mist; and the general proposition that a body composed of a single element would possess no sensation loses all its cogency. Various suggestions, more or less plausible, may be made to meet these difficulties; but, for fear of involving myself in profitless disputation, I will put the disputed passages aside for the present, and consider the questions involved from a more general point of view. We and the commentators are at sea because we have no clear notion of what either *λόγος* or *μεσότης* means; and my object in quoting these passages and pointing out some of their difficulties is only to provide material for a discussion of the meaning of these terms.

There is a passage in the *De Anima* of Alexander Aphrodisiensis (p. 59, 3 ff.) in which he shows some hesitation in accepting the term *μεσότης* as applicable to sense generally. After incorporating in his treatise, with his usual fidelity, the passage of Aristotle's work which seeks to prove that touch is a *μεσότης* by appeal to the principle that the medium is discriminative—*τὸ μέσον κριτικόν*—he continues as follows:

> "In the case of touch the conclusion is inevitable: but it is not equally clear in regard to the other senses, because there is no necessity for their organs to exhibit in their own substance one of the qualities which they supply and reveal. The eye, which is composed of water, need have no colour of its own; the ear (*ἀκοήν*) which is of air need

contain no sound, nor need the nostril possess a smell of its own. But if these senses too exhibited any of the qualities which they apprehend, they would also possess a medial character like touch—*εἶεν ἂν μεσότητες καὶ αὗται ὁμοίως τῇ ἁφῇ*. For they too will fail to apprehend things qualified just as they are, and apprehend only the superior and inferior degrees of these qualities. But touch is the most necessary of all the senses, since life cannot be carried on without it."

This passage makes evident Alexander's interpretation of the term *μεσότης*. Touch is a *μεσότης* because its organ is a *μέσον*. That is to say, the organ possesses the quality perceived in a certain degree which is called a *μέσον* because from it divergence in either direction is possible; and in the experience of contact what is apprehended is the difference between the temperature, e.g. of the organ, and that of the object. Thus the sense is a *μεσότης τῆς ἐναντιωσέως* because it is actualized in and through something which is a *μέσον τῶν ἐναντίων*; and the physical antecedent of sensation is a movement set up in the organ away from the middle point towards one of the extremes. That this is Alexander's view seems evident, and also that, if it is correct, the doubts which he suggests as to the propriety of calling all senses *μεσότητες* are hard to solve. Does Aristotle really mean to imply that the ear is noisy, the eye coloured, the nostril odorous, and that in this simple sense sensation depends upon an effect of contrast?

I cannot believe that this is what Aristotle really meant; and I think it is possible to arrive at a more satisfactory ground for generalizing from the case of touch if we re-examine that case in the light of a doctrine which Aristotle does not himself perhaps insist upon sufficiently or maintain with perfect consistency—the doctrine that flesh is not strictly the organ but rather the medium of touch. If flesh is the medium, and it is flesh which exhibits the mean temperature which makes all discriminations of temperature possible, then the analogous assertions in the other cases will be not that the organs exhibit in a mean degree the qualities apprehended, but that the

medium in each case does so. It is essential that the medium of sight should be invisible, that the medium of smell should lack odour, that the medium of touch should lack the tangible qualities. But as a matter of fact the flesh, which is the medium of touch, does not lack these qualities; and though it is impossible to represent the structure of the sense of touch as perfectly analogous to that of the other senses, yet a fairly close analogy can be suggested on these lines without falling into the absurdities to which Alexander's interpretation would lead us. The flesh, *quâ* medium of touch, is not apprehended by the sense of touch and does not possess the tangible quality, because to be hard or soft, to be warm or cold, is to possess the given quality in a superior or inferior degree to the medium. In the case of touch we are able to establish this fact empirically because it so happens that the same flesh which is employed as medium can serve a moment after as the object of the sense; and therefore its actual warmth and hardness can be estimated by the same sense which it serves as medium. Arguing analogously, we may say that the medium of sight does not possess the visual quality, colour, because to possess colour is to exhibit the same quality which the medium exhibits in a higher or lower degree than it. The medium of sight may be said from the point of view of perception to be negatively coloured, as the flesh used as medium in touching is negatively qualified in respect of the tangible quality; and the essence of a medium is that it provides in this way a mean point or centre of indifference round which *percepta* group themselves.

Enough has been said to make clear the interpretation of the term μεσότης which I wish to suggest. I expect that to many it will seem strained and ridiculous. If so I hope they will succeed in converting me to a saner view. But I cannot find anything thoroughly satisfactory on the subject in the recognized commentaries. As far as I can judge, if they were pressed the commentators would all be driven into Alexander's view and would have to answer Alexander's difficulties. I cannot however discover their answer to these difficulties. Prof. Beare says[1], 'the doctrine of μεσότης is of cardinal importance....

[1] *Greek Theories of Elementary Cognition*, p. 232.

Without grasping it we must fail to grasp his (Aristotle's) explanation of how *αἴσθησις* apprehends form without matter.' Later of seeing he says, 'it is a *μεσότης quâ* standing in a middle character between both extremes—white and black—or between any other pair of different species or different colours in the scale, so that it can relate itself to either at the same time as the other.' But this is very obscure. Sight is not grey; nor if it were would that fact go any way to explain the ability of sight to receive the form of a white object apart from its matter. Similarly Mr Hicks, in commenting on the assertion (424 b, 1) that plants lack perception because they possess no *μεσότης*, writes as follows: 'Heat is in no part of the plant so tempered as to be in respect of temperature and humidity, like the flesh in animals, intermediate between any two degrees of these qualities presented by tangible objects.' Here three degrees of the quality are postulated: (1) that of the flesh, (2) and (3) two contrasted degrees lying one on each side of this. But it is obvious that *no* temperature can be intermediate between *any* two temperatures and that *any* temperature must be intermediate between an infinite number of pairs of temperatures, and that the object does not present two degrees of temperature but one.—But I did not mean to enter into controversy. I only quote these passages to show that in respect of this problem these excellent commentaries are less lucid than they usually are, and to suggest that even if my interpretation is plainly wrong yet a tenable alternative remains to be stated.

I must now return to the question, why and in what sense is sense (or sensation) called a *λόγος*? The commentators, though not without some vacillation, are inclined to answer 'because everything depends on the ratio of the component parts of the sense organ.' Thus Prof. Beare in another part of the passage just quoted[1] says of seeing—'it is a *λόγος* or ratio in the sense that it involves in its organ a *λόγος τῆς μείξεως* of the physical elements which constitute its *αἰσθητά*, and therefore is capable of taking the "form" of any of them indefinitely.' Is the sequence of thought implied in the word 'therefore'

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 232.

quite convincing? And does not the first part of the sentence appear to involve a confusion of material and formal cause? Seeing is a λόγος in the sense that it involves in its organ a λόγος τῆς μείξεως. This surely, can only mean that seeing is the λόγος τῆς μείξεως of the eye. And if that is what was meant, would it not have been better to say that, in spite of the fact that, so stripped naked, the assertion seems to me at least to be plainly false? Mr Hicks says (on 424 a, 24)—'the terms λόγος and εἶδος are equivalent, but the former gives prominence to the notion or character, that which the definition seeks to express in words': he there translates κατὰ τὸν λόγον 'in virtue of its form.' On the phrase λύεται ὁ λόγος (424 a, 30) he writes: 'we are tempted to understand by λόγος the quantitative proportion in which materials are compounded in the sense-organ....But it seems probable that even here the word bears the same meaning as in the previous section, namely "character" or "form" which the quantitative proportion may be regarded as conditioning.' In the passage however which argues from the fact that a concord is a λόγος Mr Hicks has to admit that λόγος must stand for a numerical or quantitative ratio, and that in the object, not in the organ. Thus Mr Hicks gives two meanings to the assertion that sense (or sensation) is a λόγος, and between these two meanings he fails to establish any definite relation. (1) The first meaning is stated most clearly in his paraphrase of the words λύεται ὁ λόγος. 'If' (he writes, p. 418) 'the sense-organ is too violently affected from without, its constituent form, that is to say, its capacity to perceive, is destroyed.' In this interpretation the λόγος is resident in the organ and constitutive of it, and therefore responsible rather for the capacity of sensation than for actual percipiency. (2) The second interpretation is developed to meet the needs of the passage concerning concord. 'When we actually hear a concord,' says Mr Hicks (on 424 a, 29), 'then on Aristotle's theory of sensation the λόγος or ratio of the audible sound is transmitted to the percipient sense-organ, for it is only there that it resides in actuality.' I do not fully understand this note, particularly the last words, but it is clear that, on this interpretation, (*a*) the λόγος belongs primarily to the object not

to the organ. For though he says that the λόγος is only in actuality in the organ, the words must mean 'is only in actuality when perceived,' and this λόγος, said to be present in actuality in the organ, cannot be the same as the λόγος which as *always* present in the organ bestows capacity for sensation. It is clear (*b*) that the description λόγος is true only of sensation in actuality, not of the capacity, of sensation rather than sense. Evidently, then, this second explanation is inconsistent with the first; and it is natural that Mr Hicks should be somewhat dissatisfied with the passage which it was invented to explain.

Now whether λόγος means form or ratio it is plain that it must be the form or ratio of something: it must be resident either in the object of sense *quâ* perceived or in the subject of sense *quâ* percipient or in the physical organ of sense *quâ* organ. In this disjunction, however, the first two members are not mutually exclusive; for in sensation the percipient subject receives the perceived form. The alternatives, therefore, would be better stated in this way. When sense or sensation is said to be a λόγος that must mean, either that the capacity of sensation or that the actuality of sensation or that the organ of sensation is a λόγος. Now though Mr Hicks differs from Prof. Beare in preferring 'form' to 'ratio,' it seems to me that on the whole he agrees with him in the interpretation of the word λόγος in that he conceives the word to refer primarily to the constitution of the sense organ. Sometimes a slightly different interpretation seems to be intended. The crucial sentence, e.g. *οὐ μὴν τὸ γ' αἰσθητικῷ εἶναι οὐδ' ἡ αἴσθησις μέγεθός ἐστιν ἀλλὰ λόγος τις καὶ δύναμις ἐκείνου* (424 a, 26) is translated by Mr Hicks: 'Sensitivity, however, is not an extended magnitude, nor is the sense: they are rather a certain character or power of the organ.' 'Receptivity in the abstract,' he says in his note, 'is an immaterial form. Such a form is properly called a λόγος because it alone can be rationally defined or (in other words) is the content of the definition.' I must confess that I find it hard to interpret these sentences. But one question must be asked—if the form is in the organ why is it immaterial, except so far as all forms are immaterial? Mr Hicks cannot be thinking of the *εἶδος αἰσθητόν* which is

received *ἄνευ τῆς ὕλης* because the subject of the sentence is 'receptivity in the abstract,' i.e. the capacity for sensation, and because that kind of form is not eminently a thing capable of being 'rationally defined.' But the point I wish to make is that through all difficulties of interpretation, with the single exception of the passage concerning concord, Mr Hicks is in one respect consistent and in agreement with Prof. Beare, viz. in referring the term *λόγος* rather to the capacity than to the actuality of sensation.

In making this choice I venture to think that they are both wrong. In face of Aristotle's remarks about concord they are unable to maintain their choice consistently—though neither of them calls attention to the apparent inconsistency—and they forget the intrinsic improbability of Aristotle's choosing to define a thing by its capacity or potency rather than by its act. *Τέχνη* (which Aristotle knows quite well to be an acquired capacity, *ἕξις μετὰ λόγου*) is yet called by him a *λόγος* because in act it is a *λόγος*. *Φρόνησις* (also a capacity) is called by him a *λόγος* because in act it is a *λόγος*. Similarly *αἴσθησις* (a stronger case, because its double usage as the name of a capacity and of an act is carefully noticed by Aristotle)—*αἴσθησις* is in act a *λόγος* and may therefore be called by that name. I would suggest, then, that the passage concerning concord gives the clue to the meaning of the assertion that *αἴσθησις* is a *λόγος*, and that the term is meant to characterize not the capacity but the act of sensation. I cannot now recall all the difficulties of translation and exposition to which I have called attention in the foregoing remarks, and attempt to show in regard to each that this view gives brighter promise of a solution; but let me take one cardinal point. Of sentiency and sensation Aristotle says that neither is an extended thing (*μέγεθος*), *ἀλλὰ λόγος τις καὶ δύναμις ἐκείνου*. This means to me precisely the same as the saying with which the paragraph begins—*αἴσθησίς ἐστι τὸ δεκτικὸν τῶν αἰσθητῶν εἰδῶν ἄνευ τῆς ὕλης*. Sensation is the apprehended form of an extended thing—*καὶ δύναμις ἐκείνου*, 'or the capacity for such apprehension.' It is tempting to take *ἐκείνου* to refer neither to *μέγεθος*, nor to the subject, nor to the organ, but to the *λόγος*.

But if that suggestion is rejected, of the remaining alternatives I should prefer (following Alexander) *μέγεθος*. Of the special propriety of the term λόγος I shall have a word to say in a moment. Whether it is better translated 'form' or 'ratio' is a secondary and almost an unimportant question. The answer depends clearly on the answer to another question, viz. is it possible to regard all *αἰσθητὰ εἴδη* as λόγοι in the sense of blends of opposed qualities? In the passage on concord Aristotle seems disposed so to regard them. But in any case I think it will have to be admitted in the end that Aristotle was to some extent availing himself of a convenient equivocation in that argument. It is not really because the perceived quality is a blend that sensation is called a λόγος.

In conclusion I should like to make a suggestion with regard to the term λόγος and its conjunction with *μεσότης* here and in the *Ethics*, which to some may seem fanciful. I would suggest that λόγος, even where it may be translated 'form,' is not quite equivalent to *εἶδος*. Λόγος is the name for 'form' separated or isolated from matter. Now art, action, and sensation are all instances of what may be called the transference of form, and in each case the term λόγος is applied to the form separated and transferred. It is so separated, in the case of sensation when the process is completed and sensation is achieved, in matters of art and action when the process is initiated by a plan in the mind of artist or agent. In art and action the transference is from mind into matter—the form is materialized or embodied—in sensation the transference is from matter into mind—the form is disembodied or spiritualized. Is it a mere coincidence that for both transferences a *μέσον* is required? In action the process starts with the λόγος, which, by determining a *μέσον* in *πάθος* and *πρᾶξις*, is able to produce an act: in sensation we start from an object, which is able, by influencing a *μέσον*, to produce the λόγος which is sensation. I do not wish to press the analogy and so run the risk of distorting the symmetry of the parallel. It is easy to see that there may be rocks ahead. But I do think there is something in the comparison, if no more than this, that it is one more proof of the fact that Aristotle was saturated with Platonism, and could not

help speaking in the Platonic idiom. For the principle involved is simply the Platonic doctrine of the *ἄπειρον* and the *πέρας*, that quantitative determination makes formed matter possible and that through number the creator brought order out of chaos. *καὶ τὸ μὲν δὴ πρὸ τούτου πάντα ταῦτ' εἶχεν ἀλόγως καὶ ἀμέτρως· ὅτε δ' ἐπεχειρεῖτο κοσμεῖσθαι τὸ πᾶν,...οὕτω δὴ τότε πεφυκότα ταῦτα πρῶτον διεσχηματίσατο εἴδεσί τε καὶ ἀριθμοῖς* (*Timaeus*, 53 a, b).

J. L. STOCKS.

ON SOME ANCIENT PLANT-NAMES.

1. Πόθος, Theophr. *H. P.*, 6. 8. 3.

Theophrastus in enumerating coronary plants which are available in summer, adds almost as an afterthought, ἔτι δὲ ὁ πόθος καλούμενος. What he further says is reproduced in Pliny, *N. H.* 21. 67 and in Athenæus, 679 c, without other information about the two plants included under the name. There are two possible reasons for this: they may have been so familiar that none was needed; on the other hand there may have been none to give.

It is to be noted that Pliny embodies, without acknowledgment, perhaps the bulk of the περὶ φυτῶν of Theophrastus. It is abundantly evident that he knew little Greek and often makes schoolboy mistakes. But he must have been in contact with current commentators who were better instructed and it is tolerably clear that he had access to a better text of Theophrastus than any that has come down to us. Mayhoff in his edition of Pliny, *N. H.*, has cited from XVI. onwards the parallel passages from Theophrastus and it is always profitable to compare them.

In the present case Pliny begins with what is not now to be found in Theophrastus 'sed maxime spectabilis pothos.' We might expect this for a coronary plant; still it is a fact to be reckoned with in its identification.

Theophrastus states simply that there were two such plants called πόθος:—(i) ὁ μὲν ἔχων τὸ ἄνθος ὅμοιον τῇ ὑακίνθῳ, and (ii) ὁ ἕτερος ἄχρους λευκὸς ᾧ χρῶνται περὶ τοὺς τάφους. The commentators have contented themselves with remarking that one had blue flowers and the other white and have made arbitrary and unconvincing guesses as to what they might be.

The problem is not difficult to solve. Athenæus begins by quoting from Nicander (Fr. 144):—*πόθος. οὕτως τὶς στέφανος ὀνομάζεται.* The inference is that it was a symbol of mourning or regret, in other words a funerary wreath. Athenæus himself adds, *καὶ ἴσως ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ οὕτω καλουμένου πόθου ἄνθους πλεκόμενος.* But the argument may well run the other way. The plants used for the *πόθος* doubtless had funereal suggestions and yet may have been quite familiar under other names. And this leads to a possible solution.

The first then was the plant consecrated to the cult of Hyacinthus, which Pliny mentions in his preceding section (21. 66), 'luctum preferentis ejus, quem Apollo dilexerat, aut ex Ajacis cruore editi.' It was not the *ὑάκινθος* of Homer, though *ὅμοιον τῇ ὑακίνθῳ*, but the *ὑάκινθος γραπτή* of Theocritus, the blue Larkspur, *Delphinium Ajacis.*

The white-flowered plant was a symbol of regret in another way. It was the Asphodel, *Asphodelus ramosus.* Its roots and mallow were a common food of the Greek people. Epimenides lived upon them and Fraas goes so far as to call the Asphodel 'Die Kartoffel der Alten.' We learn from an epigram of Porphyrius which I am only able to cite from Bodæus, 869. 1, that mallow and asphodel were planted on graves presumably as food for the dead (cf. De Gubernatis, *Mythologie des Plantes,* ii. 28; Murr, *Die Pflanzenwelt in der Griechischen Mythologie,* 242). The former was not a coronary plant, but asphodel is certainly 'spectabilis.'

2. Τάλα, Arrian, *Hist. Ind.* 7.

Arrian quotes from Megasthenes an account of the natives of India in which he says:—*σιτέεσθαι δὲ τῶν δενδρέων τὸν φλοιόν· καλέεσθαι δὲ τὰ δένδρεα ταῦτα τῇ Ἰνδῶν φωνῇ Τάλα· καὶ φύεσθαι ἐπ' αὐτῶν, καθάπερ τῶν φοινίκων ἐπὶ τῇσι κορυφῇσιν οἷά περ τολύπας.* The interpretation of this passage has baffled the commentators and generated an amusing amount of heat in the minds of Salmasius and Gronovius. Yet it yields its sense to botanical study without much difficulty. The latest notice of it is that of Yule and Burnell (*Hobson-Jobson,* 706) who remark 'the *tāl* tree seems to be indicated

though confusedly.' Τάλα is undoubtedly Sanskrit *tāl* and that fixes it as the Palmyra Palm, *Borassus flabellifer*. We may applaud in passing the acumen of Megasthenes who recognized that it was a palm. The first crux is the meaning of τολύπαι. Salmasius falls on some unfortunate scholar who suggested 'carnosum quiddam' (*Plin. Ex.* 210. 2 B) and decides, 'glomi sunt putatae lanae.' Mc Crindle, quoted by Yule and Burnell, adopts this: 'a fruit resembling balls of wool.' It is of course one meaning but not the only one, and we must give the Greeks credit for the possession of some sense. Τολύπη in the LXX. (2 Kings, 4. 39) is a gourd, and we may conclude that it was used for any round fruit: as a matter of fact the fruits of the Palmyra palm are borne on the summit of the stem and are globes 6 inches in diameter.

The statement that the bark was eaten is at first sight more difficult, as palms have no 'bark' in the ordinary sense. But, as a matter of fact, φλοιός has not the restricted meaning of 'bark.' Theophrastus in defining the term (*H. P.* 1. 2. 6) may well have had the present case in view:—φλοιὸς μὲν οὖν ἐστιν τὸ ἔσχατον καὶ χωριστὸν τοῦ ὑποκειμένου σώματος. A peculiarity of the Palmyra palm is that the lower part of the trunk is invested with a dense mat of aerial roots and this would be a φλοιός. I have not met with any confirmation of the statement of Megasthenes that it was eaten by the natives of India. But it is thought probable that the Palmyra palm is not indigenous in India but was introduced at some early date from Africa. This led me to consult my own *Flora of Tropical Africa*, viii. 118, to find that my contributor, Mr C. H. Wright, has quoted a note by Speke and Grant that in Mozambique 'the roots are boiled and eaten in times of famine.' It is reasonable to suppose that the practice would accompany the palm in its migration to India.

3. *Casia*, Vergil.

Bubani (*Flora Virgil.* 32) quotes the conclusion of Schrank:—'me judice quid Cassiæ nomine veteres appellarint, nunquam devinabimur.' Two different things were known to the Romans

under the name, one an oriental spice, the other a plant; it is the identity of the latter which is the problem.

As regards the spice the Romans adopted the name casia from the Greek *κασία* which in turn was hellenized from Hebrew Keziah. It was the aromatic bark, resembling our Cinnamon, of a South Indian tree, *Cinnamomum iners*. Pliny (*N. H.* 12. 95. 98) gives a somewhat confused account of it in its commercial aspect. It was used as an unguent; whence Vergil (*G.* 2. 466) 'nec casia liquidi corrumpitur usus olivi': and was burnt with myrrh on a funeral pile (Mart. 10. 97). If we may believe Columella (3. 8) the living plant had been introduced into Rome and 'compluribus locis urbis iam casiam florentem conspicimus.' But it seems scarcely probable that this could have been the real thing, though it was no doubt something that passed for it.

But the name was also generally applied to a native and indeed widely spread European plant wholly unconnected with the spice, unless there were some fancied resemblance in the odour. Yet Pliny, with that uncritical method which excites the wrath of Salmasius, treats them as if they were identical, 'quin et in nostro orbe [casia] seritur, extremoque in margine imperii, qua Rhenus adluit, vidi in alvariis apium satam' (*N. H.* 12. 98). The Roman casia then was a bee-plant. As such Columella recommends it to be planted (9. 5); and Pliny (*N. H.* 21. 70) does the same. It is repeatedly mentioned by Vergil; it is unnecessary to cite all the familiar passages; Bubani summarises the descriptive particulars they yield, 'herbacea, humilis, viridis, suavis, bona apibus.' Vergil associates it with thyme and rosemary; Ovid (*F.* 4. 440), 'pars thyma, pars casiam,' with thyme. All this points to its being a fragrant labiate herb, easily cultivated.

The traditional identification ignores this evidence and is widely different. Conington (Verg. 1. 34) has 'an aromatic shrub, with leaves like the olive, common in the south of Europe.' This is summarised from Martyn (Virg. ii. 190), though Conington must have had the spice in his mind when he interpolated 'aromatic.' Martyn follows Bauhin and the early commentators; in modern nomenclature their plant is

Daphne Gnidium. It rests on a single passage in Pliny, 'cneorum, quod casiam Hyginus vocat, et, quod cunilaginem, conyza' (*N. H.* 21. 53). It is to be noticed that Pliny cites these equations without necessarily accepting them; they are both probably wrong. When he treats of cneorum (*N. H.* 13. 114) he gives a copious synonymy of its names but makes no mention of casia; he says it is 'frutex...similis oleastro' (whence Conington); its 'semen...ad medicinæ tantum usum' was the 'granum Gnidium' (*κόκκος Κνίδιος*), used as a drastic purgative. *Daphne Gnidium*, one of the Spurge-Laurels, is a shrub only of southern Europe, in Italy not widely spread but keeping to the western coast; Pliny's further confused statement (*N. H.* 16. 136) 'vivit...arbor casiæ vero etiam in septentrionali plaga' disposes of it.

Pliny therefore affords us little useful assistance in identifying casia and we may rely with greater confidence on the indications given by Vergil. And there the matter would have to rest but for a fresh and unexpected piece of evidence. The Pseudo Dioscorides (3. 25) has under *ὕσσωπος* a Latin synonym *κασίαλα* hitherto unexplained by the commentators. Wellmann now reads, *ὕσσωπον· Ῥωμαῖος ὑσσώπουμ...οἱ δὲ κάσιαμ*, an emendation which is palæographically convincing. We have therefore the equation, casia = *ὕσσωπος*. It must be observed that the latter has nothing to do with the modern Hyssop, a plant on which Linnæus arbitrarily conferred the name. *ὕσσωπος* is marjoram in a wide sense and the figure in the Codex Cæsareus shows that the species principally in view was our common marjoram, *Origanum vulgare*, which is widely spread throughout Europe and through Asia Minor (Cilicia, Diosc.) to the Himalayas. Like its allies, it could not escape being a bee-plant in Italy or anywhere.

We may safely conclude that Vergil's casia was perhaps the commonest and most familiar of native aromatic plants. The identity of the name with that of the spice was purely accidental. If we derive Fabius from faba, I see no reason for not accepting the etymology of Bodæus (858. 1), 'dicitur, non quod cum aromatica casia aliquam habeat similitudinem, sed quod juxta casas agricolarum nascatur.'

4. *ἄχυ*, Diosc. 1. 13.

A kind of *κασσία* or *κασία*, the fragrant bark of *Cinnamomum iners*, a tree of southern India. Cassia varied in form and quality as is still the case and was carried to Arabia, of which Dioscorides believed it to be the product; *ἔστι πλείονα εἴδη περὶ τὴν ἀρωματοφόρον Ἀραβίαν γεννώμενα.* This had the authority of the fabulous story told by Herodotus (3. 110) which may have been invented by Phœnician traders to conceal the real source of the spice.

Sprengel (Diosc. ii. 349) points out that *ἄχυ* is Hebr. *'āḥū* which occurs in LXX. as *ἄχει* or *ἄχι* and is translated Reed-grass in R.V. Gen. 41. 2, 18. Dioscorides states that it was a local name for *κασσία* in Arabia, *ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἄχυ καλεῖται.* According to Jerome cited in Stephanus, it was an Egyptian word meaning 'omne quod in palude virens nascitur.' Wiedemann (*Altägypt. Wörter.*, 16) derives the demotic àchi = calamus, from the root *ἀχά*, to be green.

We have then the fact that cassia was called reed in Arabia. It is easy to see in this the origin of the statement of Herodotus, *ἡ δὲ ἐν λίμνῃ φύεται οὐ βαθέῃ*, and of Strabo, *κασσίαν τὴν ἐκ λιμνῶν.* The problem is to explain why it was so called. Premising that the Phœnician traders who brought it from India would simply receive it as a trade-product of whose source they would know nothing, the solution is not difficult, though apparently it has not been given before.

As still met with in commerce, cassia consists of brown 'quills' roughly resembling pieces of reed; they consist of the bark from the more slender branches of the trees which rolls up in drying into a slender pipe: 'tenui cute verius quam cortice,' Plin. *N. H.* 12. 95. Dioscorides calls it *σῦριγξ* which Liddell and Scott translate awkwardly, 'the tube of the cassia' instead of simply a cassia-quill; Galen (*Antid.* 1. 14) has *συριγγίς.*

5. Κόρχορος, Theophr. *H. P.* 7. 7. 2.

Much research has been expended on this word, but the result needs summarising. It is only mentioned once by Theophrastus amongst *λάχανα* and apparently those that are eaten raw. Two other statements are made about it: it was *παροιμιαζόμενος διὰ πικρότητα*, its bitterness was proverbial; and it was *ἔχων τὸ φύλλον ὠκιμῶδες* which in Theophrastean terminology means that its leaves were lanceolate in shape. On these data an identification would be hazardous. But the Pseudo Dioscorides (ed. Wellmann, 2. 178) gives *κόρχορος* as a synonym of *ἀναγαλλὶς ἡ κυανῆ* which is *Anagallis caerulea*, the blue-flowered form of the common pimpernel, *A. arvensis*. Of this Ray (*Hist.* ii. 1023) remarks 'sapor totius plantæ acris.' In modern times it has been eaten; 'it makes no unpleasant salad, and in some places is used as a common pot-herb' (Withering, *British Pl.* 1830, ii. 296). Salad plants are generally bitter, e.g. lettuce and endive, the 'bitter herbs' of the Passover. *κόρχορος* was however in little esteem amongst the Greeks; the scholiast on Nicander, *Ther.* 864, calls it *λάχανον εὐτελές*, and Suidas preserves the proverb, *καὶ κόρχορος ἐν λαχάνοις*, of those who claim a position to which they are not entitled. The identification is confirmed by Nicander, *Ther.* 626, *κόρχορον ἢ μύωπα*. It was called *μύωψ* because the flowers close on the approach of rain, owing to the withdrawal of the stimulus of the sun; hence the popular name, 'Poor man's weather-glass.' The scholiast misses the point when he explains, *ἔστι δὲ ἀεὶ κατακλινόμενον· ὅθεν καὶ μύοεν αὐτὸ εἶπεν*; there are plenty of prostrate plants in Greece, but only one pimpernel. So far is clear; the difficulty arises with Pliny who gives the name to a widely different plant. In paraphrasing Diosc. 7. 128 he has 'anagallida aliqui acoron vocant,' *N. H.* 25. 144. All the lexicons give corchorum for acoron in this passage and it has been accepted by Lenz, Fraas, and Liddell and Scott. But it rests on no manuscript authority, and Mayhoff had no choice but to restore acoron. Yet Pliny (*N. H.* 25. 157) knew perfectly well what the Greeks meant

by acoron; the only explanation seems to be that mistaking the sound he dictated the wrong word, as I shall show in the next note he also did probably in another case.

He attempts however to dispose of *κόρχορος* itself on its own merits in other passages, *N. H.* 21. 89 and 183, and identifies it with an Egyptian pot-herb. In the former he merely mentions the name, in the latter he gives the briefest description: 'Corchorum Alexandrini: herba est convolutis foliis ad similitudinem mori.' Nothing can be made of this as it stands. The only solution seems to be that of Bodæus, 817, that it is a vague recollection of *ἀναγαλλίς*, and that convolutis foliis applies to the flowers and recalls *μύωψ*. This kind of synthesis is unfortunately characteristic of Pliny, who would know nothing at first hand of the Egyptian plant, and excites the indignation of Salmasius. All travellers from Prosper Alpinus onwards have unhesitatingly identified it with *Corchorus olitorius*, Linnæus having adopted the generic name from Pliny. Alpinus remarks 'Ægyptiis in cibo nil familiarius aut gratius.' To this may be added that there is some resemblance in the foliage to that of the white mulberry, *Morus alba*. It is one of the plants which produce jute-fibre, and it is widely spread over India and tropical Africa, being everywhere in use as a pot-herb. Decandolle (*Plantes cultivées*, 105) remarks that 'les anciens Grecs ne la connaissent pas.' But the climate of the northern Mediterranean would not suit it. The fate of *κόρχορος* has been at least singular: it started as a Pimpernel and ends as a Jute. It had also some other meanings. In Ar. *Vesp.* 239 it obviously cannot be a plant. Hesychius gives it also as the name of a fish; it might be so called because it was a worthless kind.

6. *Ἄκορον*, Diosc. 1. 2 and *ἄκαιρον*, Diosc. 4. 144.

Liddell and Scott give *ἄκορος* as the name of a plant and *ἄκορον* as that of its root. The only authority for the former word appears to be the Aldine edition of Theophrastus where it is now regarded as a f. l. for *ἄκανος* (*H. P.* 1. 13. 3). *Ἄκορον* is the name of a plant described by Dioscorides which grew in Galatia and Colchis and of which the rhizomes, *ῥίζαι*,

were used in medicine; Pliny (*N. H.* 25, 157) reproduces Dioscorides and calls it acoron.

Lenz and others identify *ἄκορον* with the sweet flag, *Acorus Calamus*. This cannot be sustained; Boissier states that it is unknown in Asia Minor, nor does it grow in Greece. It is a native of India where the rhizomes are still esteemed in medicine. Furthermore Dioscorides (1. 18) describes it independently as *κάλαμος ἀρωματικός*, merely remarking *φύεται μὲν ἐν Ἰνδίᾳ*. The drug was imported and the plant itself was introduced in the middle ages into northern Europe where it is now naturalised. There can be little doubt that Sprengel (Diosc. ii. 344) was right in identifying *ἄκορον* with the yellow flag *Iris pseudacorus*, which is frequent in Greece and Asia Minor; and this appears to be confirmed by the figure in the Cæsarean Codex in Vienna.

The identification of *ἄκορον* with a root traces back to the statement of Pliny (*N. H.* 25. 158), 'necnon inveniuntur qui oxymyrsinæ radicem acoron vocant.' It is to be noted that in Pliny's age the attempt was being made, doubtless in the interests of medicine, to transfer the plant-names of Greece to the plants of Italy. As the method was mainly literary errors and confusion were inevitable. In the case of *ὀξυμυρσίνη* the adjustment was accurate. Pliny tells us who made it:— 'Castor oxymyrsinen...ex qua fiunt ruri scopæ, ruscum vocavit' (*N. H.* 23. 166). There can be no sort of doubt that both Greek and Latin names belong to our Butcher's Broom, *Ruscus aculeatus*. Then why was it also identified with *ἄκορον*? Pliny makes the puzzling statement (*N. H.* 15. 27) 'quam quidam oxymyrsinen vocant...aliqui acoron a similitudine.' There is of course not the slightest resemblance. Taking the passage as a whole I conclude that what he means is that the Butcher's Broom, 'myrtus silvestris,' was so called on account of its resemblance to the myrtle, 'myrtus sativa.' *ἄκορον* still remains in need of explanation.

I am driven to the conclusion that it is to be found in a misreading of *ἄκαιρον* which is given by Dioscorides and is evidently a popular name not inappropriate for a prickly shrub such as Butcher's Broom. The resulting confusion

seems to have been appreciated and a substitute invented, for Pliny adds, 'quidam hanc acorion vocare malunt' (*N. H.* 25. 158).

Such a confusion is far from an isolated case. It is generally admitted for example that Pliny has mixed up *κονίλη* and *κόννζα*. An explanation of such errors may be found in his method of composition. He was a man of many occupations and he is supposed to have had his authorities read to him and to have dictated his conclusions. Error would creep in either way. Pliny's task was not scientific but literary. It was an attempt to supply his countrymen with a definite plant nomenclature based on that of Greece. The interesting question arises why it should have been necessary. All botanical knowledge rests on an empirical basis. Every race at an early stage of civilisation learns by experience the properties of the vegetation that surrounds it. The 'herbarum vires' as Pliny (*N. H.* 25. 16) justly says 'agrestes litterarumque ignari experiuntur, ut qui soli inter illas vivant.' Popular names are given to plants possessing distinctive characters. A vast body of them in the case of Greece has been preserved for us by Theophrastus and Dioscorides. Nothing comparable has come down to us in the case of Rome except what can be collected from the poets. Yet it must have existed; but no botanical writer has handed them down and Pliny ignores them. Speaking of shrubs he says (*N. H.* 21. 52) 'sunt et alia genera nominibus Græcis indicanda, quia nostris majore ex parte hujus nomenclaturæ defuit cura.' We may draw a parallel from our own history; we possessed in the Elizabethan age a copious popular plant-nomenclature. This would have been in great measure lost to us if we had only the herbal writers to draw from who tried to fit classical names to our native plants.

7. Ἐπιτηλίς, Nicand. *Ther.* 852.

Little has been done to explain the mass of plant names in Nicander. Meanwhile they have drifted into lexicons merely with meanings which tell nothing. Occasionally a clue is furnished from some other source.

ἐπιτηλίς is the name of one of two kinds of poppy (μήκων). Liddell and Scott explain 'with a husk or pod,' but that is not distinctive as it is implied in μήκων. Dioscorides, 4. 65 describing μήκων κερατῖτις, has καρπὸν...ὅμοιον τῆς τήλιδος. Now τῆλις is Fenugreek, *Trigonella Fœnum-græcum*, which has a long slender pod. μήκων ἐπιτηλίς may be rendered therefore, 'the poppy with the pod of Fenugreek.' It is thus identical with μήκων κερατῖτις, the Horned Poppy, *Glaucium flavum*.

8. Αἰγίς, Theophr. *H. P.* 3. 9. 3.

This has perplexed lexicographers. Liddell and Scott define it as 'a yellow kernel in the pith of the pine.' This is obviously inadmissible for no pine has any visible pith. Theophrastus describes it with precision; ἐπεὶ καὶ τὴν αἰγίδα τὴν καλουμένην ἡ θήλεια τῆς πεύκης ἔχει· τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ τὸ ἐγκάρδιον αὐτῆς.

πεύκη θήλεια (*H. P.* 3. 9. 4) is the Corsican Pine, *Pinus Laricio*, which extends along the northern Mediterranean from Spain to Greece. It bears the name Corsican because, as Theophrastus observes, οὐδὲν εἶναι [sc. τὰ ἐν τῇ Λατίνῃ] πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῇ Κύρνῳ (5. 8. 1).

In most trees there is a marked difference between the softer pale sap-wood (*alburnum*) and the harder darker heart-wood (*duramen*); the one is gradually converted into the other. The change is most conspicuous in ebony where the heart-wood is black and the sap-wood white. By ἐγκάρδιον Theophrastus means heart-wood and this therefore identifies αἰγίς. He explains quite correctly how the sap-wood decays, ὅταν ἐκπεσόντα περισαπῇ τὰ λευκὰ καὶ τὰ κύκλῳ, and the αἰγίς remains. He further explains (3. 9. 7), that ἡ αἰγὶς εὔχρως διὰ τὸ ἔνδαδον, it becomes ruddy through resinous infiltration.

It would have been scarcely necessary to labour this but for a difficulty started by Pliny (*N. H.* 16. 187). He states, 'larix femina habet quam Græci vocant ægida mellei coloris.' He was in error in translating πεύκη θήλεια by larix femina, for larix is the Larch which he was probably unaware was not found in Greece. This led him into the further error of trans-

lating *εὔχρως* by melleus. He could know little about the Larch except from hearsay; but Bodæus (166. 1) traces his information to its source in Diosc. 1. 71 *ἡ [ῥητίνη] μὲν γὰρ τίς ἐστι λευκὴ ἡ δὲ ἐλαιώδης ἡ δὲ μέλιτι ἔοικεν ὥσπερ ἡ λάριξ.* This is quite accurate; it is the modern Venice Turpentine. It may be noted that the Greek equivalent of melleus is *χλωρός* (*Il.* 12. 631).

It still remains to explain why the heart-wood of the Corsican Pine was called *αἰγίς*. The reason is not far to seek. A transverse section of a trunk would show the round disk of reddish heart-wood surrounded by a circular zone of pale sap-wood and that would suggest the *ἄντυξ φαεινή* of a shield.

9. Ἀφία, Theophr. *H. P.* 7. 7. 3.

Theophrastus discusses the behaviour of plants when they wake in spring from their winter sleep, and it must always be an attractive field of 'nature-study.' He proceeds:—*καὶ τὰ μὲν εὐθὺς ἅμα τῇ βλαστήσει τὸ ἄνθος ἀφίησι καθάπερ ἡ ἀφία, τὰ δὲ ὕστερον οὐ πολλῷ καθάπερ ἡ ἀνεμώνη.* This is all that has come down to us about *ἀφία*. The passage is interesting in itself as an example of the thoroughly inductive method which Theophrastus adopted. There is no break between it and modern investigation. In this respect he is in the strongest contrast with Pliny who is content to compile from second-hand information without any attempt to estimate its value critically.

ἀνεμώνη was the familiar *Anemone coronaria* of the south, which first throws up its leaves and then produces flowers. But what was *ἀφία*? The more recent botanists have abandoned it to the lexicographers. Bodæus gives the current conjectures of his day. The least wide of the mark identifies it with *βήχιον*, our Coltsfoot, *Tussilago Farfara*. This was apparently adopted by Stephanus but fails to fit the facts; for though it throws up its flowers in spring, the leaves do not follow till summer. Liddell and Scott give the puzzling definition, 'a certain plant used for food.' The number of

native plants which the Greek peasantry did eat is amazing and according to Heldreich (*Die Nutzpflanzen Griechenlands*) they do so still, but not one of them will fit *ἀφία*. The statement is the blunder of some lexicographer who found in Gaza's translation 'cum germine florem edunt' and misinterpreted it.

The true identification is undoubtedly the brilliant one of Kurt Sprengel (*Hist. rei herb.* 1. 95) given as long ago as 1807 and apparently overlooked ever since. It is *Ranunculus Ficaria*, our Lesser Celandine, beloved of Wordsworth, abundant everywhere in Greece and flowering in February. It is the *χελιδόνιον τὸ μικρόν*, Diosc. 2. 181, of the later Greeks. The modern herbalists still maintained something of the simple directness of their Greek sources. Lyte (*Niewe Herball*, 1578), though he knew nothing of *ἀφία*, uses almost the language of Theophrastus. 'The small Celandyne was so called, bycause that it beginneth to spring and to floure, at the comming of the swallowes.'

The passage in Theophrastus has an interest in another way as it fixes, as far as plants are concerned, the meaning of *ἀφίημι*. Liddell and Scott translate *ἄνθος ἀφιεῖσαι*, *Od.* 7. 126, as of vines 'shedding their blossom.' This would be disastrous and is in contradiction to the continuous fertility of the picture. Cowper is said to be defective in scholarship, but he appears to me to get usually pretty close to the sense, and he translates, 'the grapes | here put their blossom forth.'

W. THISELTON-DYER.

EMENDATIONS OF THE TEXT OF SOCRATES SCHOLASTICUS.

The History of Socrates Scholasticus covers the years A.D. 306—439; the author was born in 381, and was therefore contemporary with much that he related. His work was in the years 540—550 translated into Latin by Epiphanius Scholasticus at the instance of Cassiodorius, together with the histories of Sozomen and Theodoret, who made the work of Socrates the basis of their own. These Latin texts have only survived in a work called the *Historia Tripartita*, wherein Cassiodorius combined them in one whole in twelve books, adding before each section the name of the historian from whom it was taken.

The work of Socrates was translated into Armenian by one Philo of Tirak in the year 696, by order of Nerses Kamsarakan. This version survives in a MS. of the Armenian Patriarchal Library in the Convent of St James in Jerusalem, and in two MSS. of the Convent Library at Valarshapat. It was printed together with the old Armenian Version of the Life of Pope Sylvester in Valarshapat in 1897.

A comparison of these Latin and Armenian versions with the Greek text as edited by Valesius and reprinted by the Clarendon Press at Oxford, in 1844, affords the emendations printed in the following pages.

Latin refers to the version of Epiphanius Scholasticus.

Arm. refers to the version of Philo of Tirak.

Book I.

Bk I ch. 2 § 1 *ἐκ τούτων ὁ Ἡρκούλιος εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν πάλιν βασιλείας ἀρθεὶς ἐπεχείρησεν ἀπολέσαι τὸν υἱὸν Μαξέντιον.* Here Arm. renders *ἀπολέσαι* by 'strip' or 'render naked.' The Latin has: voluit filium regno privare. We must therefore read *ἀποδῦσαι*[1], and perhaps absolve Maximianus of the sinister wish to murder his son.

I 2 § 8 *τρόπαιον, ὃ μέχρι νῦν τοῖς βασιλείοις φυλάττεται* Arm. supplies *ἐν* before *τοῖς* which has dropt out after *νῦν*.

I 6 § 34 *καθυφεὶς τὸ κινούμενον ζήτημα.* The codex Allatii has *καθ. τὸ κινοῦν τὴν ταραχὴν ζήτημα.* So Latin: deferens quaestionem quae moveret tumultum. So also Arm.

ibidem μὴ γένοιντο σύμψηφοι Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. The codex Allatii has: *σύμψηφοι οἷς Ἀλέξανδρος ἔγραφε.* So Latin: ne consentirent scriptis Alexandri. So also Arm.

I 7 § 2 *ἡ γὰρ ὅλη ἐπιστολὴ ἐν τοῖς Εὐσεβίου εἰς τὸν Κωνσταντίνου βίον κεῖται βιβλίοις.* The Florence codex adds: *μέρος ἐπιστολῆς* to shew that the citation which follows is not the entire letter. The Arm. makes the same addition.

I 8 § 11 *καὶ τοιαῦτα μὲν... Εὐσέβιος.* Latin: Haec itaque... Pamphili recitavit Eusebius. The Arm. also adds *Pamphili recitavit*, involving the words *ὁ Παμφίλου διεξῆλθεν* read in the codex Allatii[2].

I 8 § 13 *ὅτου χάριν δὲ τούτων ἐμνημονεύσαμεν.* After *τούτων* the codex Allatii adds *ἰδικῶς*, which Arm. also attests.

I 8 § 15 *γυμνὴν γνώμην.* Latin: puram scientiam. So also the Arm. Both versions therefore suggest *γνῶσιν* which is read in the codex Allatii.

I 8 § 28 *ἡ δὲ ἐν Νικαίᾳ παρὰ τῆς μεγάλης συνόδου μεγαλοφώνως* (so Oxford reprint. Valesius *μεγαλοφρόνως*) *ἐξενεχθεῖσα*

[1] *ἀποδῦσαι* was suggested to me by Prof. Bywater as better than my own conjecture *ἀπογυμνῶσαι*.

[2] For information respecting the codex Allatii see the close of this article.

συμφωνία τῆς πίστεως. The codex Allatii has...*συνόδου καὶ ὑπὸ Εὐσεβίου μεγαλοφώνως ἐπαινεθεῖσα συμφωνία....* So Latin: Concordia ergo fidei a magno in Nicea prolatae concilio, ab Eusebio clara voce laudata, haec est. Arm. equally attests the variant of codex Allatii.

I 8 § 31. Arm. omits the words *τῆς λέξεως τοῦ ὁμοουσίου ἐπιλαβόμενοι*, which may well be an early gloss.

I 8 § 32 *κατὰ μερισμὸν δὲ, ὡς βώλου χρυσίδες δύο ἢ τρεῖς.* Latin renders: sicut ex massa auri anuli duo vel tres. So also the Armenian. We should therefore supply *χρυσοῦ* after *βώλου*, which by itself hardly gives the sense of a nugget of gold.

I 9 § 7 *Ἀλεξάνδρου προκεχειρισμένων.* Valesius writes: melius scriberetur *προκεχειροτονημένων*, and this is attested by Arm.

I 9 § 30. Arm. and Latin both omit the words *ἀφανισθῆναι δὲ τὰ ἀσεβῆ αὐτοῦ συγγράμματα.*

I 9 § 31 *ὁ θεὸς ὑμᾶς διαφυλάξοι.* Arm. substitutes: 'And such a one shall on no account be held worthy of any pardon,' evidently rendering a Greek text.

I 9 § 64 *κατὰ πόλεις προσέθηκε.* Valesius writes: scribendum omnino est *προέθηκε*, id est *proposuit*; and that is implied by Arm.

I 11 § 3 *καὶ διακόνους.* Arm. adds *καὶ ὑποδιακόνους* with the Florence codex and Sozomenus (bk I cap. 23), who here copies Socrates.

I 12 § 5 *ἡ δὲ ἀσφαλέστερον ποιοῦσα.* Arm. adds *καιρόν* before *ποιοῦσα*, probably a gloss.

I 13 § 8 *προσοῦσα χάρις.* Arm. *προοῦσα* 'pre-existing,' which the context needs.

I 13 § 13. After the words *ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος βασιλείας* Arm. adds with the codex Allatii the words: *ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Κωνσταντίνου βασιλείας ἐννεκαιδέκατον ἔτος ἦν.*

I 14 § 5 *ἔχετε ἐν πᾶσι συμψήφους.* The sense demands *ἔξετε* which is involved by the Latin *habebitis.*

I 15 § 1 *Τοῦτον φησὶν ὁ Ῥουφῖνος κομιδῇ νήπιον ὄντα παίζειν σὺν ἑτέροις ἡλικιώταις ἱερὸν παίγνιον.*

Arm. involves *ἱερατικόν*, which is probably right as the game was a *μίμησις ἱερωσύνης.*

I 16 § 1 *ἐποίει τε τοῦτο κατὰ τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις, καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἐπωνύμῳ.* Valesius notes: *ἐποίει δὲ τοῦτο κατά τε τὰς κτλ.* and his conjecture is borne out by Arm.

I 16 § 1. The MSS. have *χρηματίζειν δὲ δευτέραν Ῥώμην.* Latin and Arm. omit *δέ* which Valesius expunged.

I 16 § 1 *πλησίον τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἐφίππου παρέθηκε*, where as involved by the Latin: et in strategio iuxta equestrem statuam ejus constituta, Valesius conjectured *παρέστηκεν*, which the Armenian also confirms.

I 17 § 2 *οἱ δὲ φεύγοντες τὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ χώσαντες τὸν τόπον Ἀφροδίτης κατ' αὐτοῦ ναὸν κατασκευάσαντες ἐπέστησαν ἄγαλμα μὴ ποιοῦντες μνήμην τοῦ τόπου.*

Arm. = But they, shunning the things of Christ, concealed the tomb: having prepared a temple of Aphrodite on the spot, they erected an image, in order that the Christians seeing the image might not make a mention of the spot.

That *κατέκρυψαν* stood in Socrates' text after the words *τὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ* is fairly certain if we compare the paraphrase of Sozomenus II ch. 1: *ὑπὸ πολλῷ χώματι τὸν τῇδε τόπον κατέκρυψαν.* Then after *ἄγαλμα* some clause may through homoioteleuton have dropped out of this kind: *ἵνα οἱ Χριστιανοὶ ἴδωσι τὸ ἄγαλμα.* A particle *καί* may have dropped out before *ἐπέστησαν.*

I 18 § 2 *αὐτὸς εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὸν πῆχυν Ἀλέξανδρον μετατιθέναι ἐκέλευσε.* So Valesius restored the text formerly read thus: *αὐτὸς εἰς τ. ἐκ. τ. π. Ἀλεξανδρέων μετ. ἐκ.* Arm. has *αὐτὸς εἰς τ. ἐκ. Ἀλεξανδρέων τ. π. μετ. ἐκ.* It is difficult to suppose that Constantine could have enjoined the Patriarch Alexander to take the Nile gauge into the churches and away from the Serapeum, for Alexander died early in 326, and the

injunction is dated by Socrates after (*μετὰ ταῦτα* I 18 § 1) the pilgrimage of Helena to Jerusalem which at the earliest took place in 327, according to Tillemont in 328.

I 18 § 4 *ὑπὸ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοῦ χρόνους.* Arm. involves *τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρ.* which Valesius already conjectured.

I 18 §§ 15–16 *ὅπου γὰρ—ἐκ λέξεων.* Arm. omits.

I 19 § 5 *πρὸς ὀλίγον.* So Arm. The codex Allatii has *πρὸ ὀλίγου*, which Valesius preferred.

I 21 § 17 *ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔμφρων τις ὢν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκοδομήν.* Valesius suggests *ἔμφροντις ὤν* which Arm. supports.

I 23 § 2 *τὴν Ἀθανασίου χειροτονίαν διέβαλλον καὶ ὡς ἀναξίου πρὸς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν καὶ μὴ ὡς ὑπὸ ἀξιοπίστων γεγενημένου.*

Valesius conjectures *καὶ ὡς μὴ ὑπὸ ἀξ. γεγενημένην*, and Arm. bears out his conjecture.

I 24 § 2 *Γεώργιος...ἐν τῷ ἐγκωμίῳ τῷ εἰς Εὐσέβιον τὸν Ἐμισηνὸν ἔγραψεν εἰρηκέναι· καὶ κτλ.*

Valesius would expunge *εἰρηκέναι* as having crept in from the margin. Arm. involves *ἐγκωμίῳ ὃ εἰς Εὐσ. τ. Ἐμ. ἔγραψεν εἴρηκεν. καὶ κτλ.*

I 24 § 3 *Γεώργιος δὲ περὶ Εὐσταθίου γράφει.* Arm. introduces *ἀπίθανα* before *γράφει* transliterating the Greek word in Armenian characters. Perhaps it stood in the margin of the Greek original and so was lost in the Greek MSS.; but it is not out of place in the text.

I 24 § 7 *Εὐσέβιος δὲ παραιτησάμενος.* The sense is incomplete, and Valesius writes: supplendum est igitur *ἀπὸ κοινοῦ*, id quod praecessit, *τὰς στάσεις κατέπαυσεν.* Arm. supplies: 'quitted the bishopric of Antioch and went to Caesarea his own see.' The words are probably a gloss, for it does not appear that Eusebius ever so far accepted the invitation of the Arians of Antioch as to repair thither, and Sozomen (II ch. 19) paraphrasing this passage of Socrates writes: *ὅγε μὴν Εὐσέβιος ἔγραψε τῷ βασιλεῖ παραιτούμενος· ἐπαινέσας δὲ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραίτησιν ὁ βασιλεύς, κτλ.*

I 26 § 6 Εἰ μὴ ταῦτα οὕτως κτλ. This entire Pericope, as Valesius notes, is absent from all the MSS. except that of Leo Allatius. Arm. also supplies it; and Sozomen (2 ch. 27), who copied Socrates, gives it.

I 27 § 1 ἀνακινεῖν ἐπεχείρει τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν. Arm. substitutes Αἴγυπτον for Ἀλεξάνδρειαν, which may be right, for Sozomen (2 ch. 27) explains that they stirred up not only Alexandria by their letters, but Egypt, the Thebaid and Libya.

I 27 § 3. Arm. omits the words μέρος ἐπιστολῆς τοῦ βασίλεως, which Valesius adds from the Florence codex alone.

I 27 § 8 Ἀλύπιος καὶ Μακάριος πρεσβύτεροι. Arm. involves Ἄπις καὶ Μακάριος πρ. Valesius notes: Athanasius in Apologetico Apim habet pro Alypio.

I 27 § 14. After the words τὰ ἱερέως πράττειν ἐτόλμησε Arm. adds as follows: meanwhile Athanasius having arrived at Mareotis began to administer the parishes (παροικίας) which were there; and having heard about Ischyras he immediately sent Macarius to see if it were true that resembling a priest he made bold to discharge a priest's duties.

Owing to the homoioteleuton (viz. τὰ ἱερέως πράττειν ἐτόλμησε) the above words have fallen out of all the Greek MSS.

I 28 § 4 συνόδῳ συναρέσαντα. Arm. adds: "however of necessity he turned up," in Greek: ὅμως ἐξ ἀνάγκης παρῆν, words which have not the appearance of being a mere echo of what follows in the text.

I 30 Ἀχαὰβ δὲ, ὁ καὶ Ἰωάννης. Arm. has Arphaq for Achaab, which agrees better with Athanasius who in his Apology (2 p. 783) has the name thus: ἀρχὰφ ὁ καὶ Ἰωάννης.

I 31 § 3 ἅμα τοῖς ἐχθροῖς δικασταῖς εἶναι. Arm. involves the reading of the codex Allatii ἅμα τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἀπιέναι, 'quod magis placet,' says Valesius, though without adopting it.

I 31 § 4. Before ὡς οὐδείς Arm. omits καί. Valesius notes: delenda est particula καί, utpote superflua.

I 31 § 5 οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀποσταλέντες...ὑπομνήματα ποιήσαντες ὡς ἀληθῶς γενομένων ἃ ὁ κατήγορος ἔλεγεν εἶχον.

Valesius notes: Hic locus mutilus est, ut nemo non videt. Arm. corrects to *ἐποίησαν ὡς ἀλ. γεν. ἃ ὁ κατήγορος Ἰσχύρας ἔλεγεν*, omitting *εἶχον*.

1 32 § 3 *τῆς ὑψηλοπολιτῶν πόλεως*. Valesius notes: Apud Athanasium rectius legitur *ὑψηλιτῶν πόλεως*, which reading Arm. bears out.

1 33 § 2 *δικαίως καὶ λοιπὸν παρ' αὐτῶν προσδεχθεὶς, καὶ ἐξορισθέντα τὸν Ἀθανάσιον αἰνιττόμενοι.*

Arm. involves *δικαίως καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν προσδεχθείη*, omitting *λοιπόν*. Valesius conjectured both changes. It then continues *διὰ φθόνον ἐξορ. τὸν Ἀθ. αἰνιττόμενοι.* Valesius wrote of the last words: Locus mutilus, cujus sensum facilius est assequi quam verba corrigere. Vult igitur dicere Socrates, Episcopos in epistola synodica subindicare Athanasium, cum dicunt: *πάντα μὲν ἐξορίσας τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ φθόνον καὶ πᾶσαν μακρὰν ἀπελάσας βασκανίαν.*

Arm. testifies to the use of the word *φθόνος*. The bishops hinted that Arius had been banished because of Athanasius' jealousy. Perhaps however we should read *ἐξορίσαντα* and take it that Athanasius had exiled Arius out of spite.

1 34 § 5 *μετὰ ἱερῶν τινῶν οὓς περὶ αὐτὸν εἶχεν.* Arm. equals *μεθ' ἑταίρων τινῶν*, which agrees better with the phrase used in the same context by Athanasius himself in his second apology: *μεθ' ἑτέρων τινῶν.*

1 35 § 3 *ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἰσχύει διαβολή.* The Arm. adds *μέγα* before *ἰσχύει* with the codex Allatii and the Latin.

1 36 § 4 *ὁ Μάρκελλος ἀντιπράττειν αὐτῷ βουλόμενος.* The Latin has contra eum scribere volens, as also Arm. Therefore read *ἀντισυγγράφειν*, which stands in the codex Allatii.

1 38 § 3 *τίνα δὲ τρόπον ἐτεχνάζετο.* Latin renders quodam modo iusiurandum arte deludens. So also Arm. Therefore add *τὸν ὅρκον* after *τρόπον*.

1 38 § 8. Arm. renders here the text of the codex Allatii: *καὶ ἅμα τοῖς διαχωρήμασι παρεκπίπτει ἡ ἕδρα, τότε ὑπὸ τῶν ἰατρῶν καλούμενον ἀπέφθισμα παραυτίκα διὰ τῆς ἕδρας*

ἐξέπιπτεν, αἵματός τε πλῆθος ἐπηκολούθει, καὶ τὰ λεπτὰ τῶν ἐντέρων, συνέτρεχεν ἅμα αὐτῷ σπληνί τι καὶ ἤπατι.

The Latin partially agrees: Quo facto, defectus cum quidem cum effusione corripuit, et una cum stercoribus meatus quoque prolapsus est. Tunc ergo concidit, et sanguinis multitudo cum subtilibus intestinis subsequenter effluxit: decurrebantque pariter cum splene etiam interna iecoris.

Arm. renders *ἀπέφθισμα* which is not in Liddell and Scott by *Nakhalí oullaki* which must mean the rectum[1].

I 38 § 11 *ἐκ θεοῦ μεμαρτυρῆσθαι τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν ἔφησεν.* Latin renders *ἔφησεν* by *cognosceret*, Arm. by 'he found.'

I 38 § 13 *τὸν τῷ πάππῳ ἐπώνυμον Κώνσταντα.* Arm. involves *ὁμώνυμον* which is read in the codex Allatii.

I 39 § 4 *πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων πόλει καὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπωνύμῳ.*

καὶ is needed, says Valesius, in both places. In the former Arm. supplies it, in the latter Arm. and codex Allatii together.

Book II.

II 1 § 6 *ὦ ἱερὲ τοῦ θεοῦ.* So the Florentine codex. Arm.: *ὦ ἱερεῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.* This is the vulgar reading.

II 2 § 2 *περιέσεσθαι δὲ τούτου οὐκ ἂν δύναιντο, εἰ μὴ ὑπονοστήσῃ Ἀθανάσιος.*

The context requires the author to mean *either*: they could succeed, in expelling the dogma of consubstantiality, if Athanasius should not return; *or* they could not succeed, if he should return. Valesius recognises the need of emendation and writes: *hic locus mutilus est et mendosus*, and notes that Nicephorus paraphrased it thus: *περιέσεσθαι δὲ τούτου οὐκ ἄν ποτε ᾤοντο.* Sozomen also paraphrases: *ᾤοντο δὲ τοῦτο κατορθῶσαι ῥαδίως εἰ κτλ.*

[1] *ἀπέφθισμα* looks very like a vox-nihili. ? *ἀπειθισμα* or *ἀπευθυσμόν*—this latter being sometimes used for the rectum. The usual term, however, is *τὸ ἀπευθυσμένον* (i.e. *ἀπηυθισμένον*), scil. *ἔντερον*. I. B.

ᾤοντο is also supported by Arm. which = περιεσεσθαι δὲ ἐν τούτῳ ᾤοντο εἰ μὴ ὕπον. Aθ. which I believe to be right. ἐν τούτῳ figures in the famous words ἐν τούτῳ νικᾶ.

II 2 § 3 τὴν διαθήκην ὁ πρεσβύτερος καὶ τὰ ἐνταλθέντα παρὰ τοῦ κατοιχομένου βασίλεως προσφέρει Κωνσταντίῳ.

Arm. = κατὰ τὰ ἐνταλθέντα..., as if the deceased monarch had instructed the presbyter to take his will to Constantius. After διαθήκην the words καὶ τὰ ἐντ. would be superfluous.

II 2 § 10 Αἱ γὰρ ἐν Ἰλλυρίοις καὶ τὰ ἑσπέρια μέρη τέως ἡσύχαζον.

Valesius suggests καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἑσπ. μ. which Arm. involves.

II 4 Ἀκάκιος. So Arm. Latin has Agapius.

II 7 § 2 καὶ καθιστὰς συνέδριον.

Both Sozomen and the codex Allatii have καθίσας, *quod non displicet* says Valesius. Arm. also has it.

Ibid. Εὐσέβιον δὲ ἐκ τῆς Νικομηδείας μεταστήσας, τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἀναδείκνυσι.

Arm. and codex Allatii agree in the remarkable reading: τῆς μεγαλοπόλεως ἐπίσκ. ἀναδ.

II 8 § 5 Πλάκιτος. Arm., Latin, and codex Allatii agree in reading Φλάκιλλος and Valesius notes: rectius scribitur hoc nomen...Flaccillus. The letter of Pope Julius also confirms this reading of the name which Arm. has elsewhere.

II 8 § 6. Arm. and Latin omit προηγουμένως.

II 8 § 7. Arm. and Latin omit words: Ἐπανελθὼν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐξορίας, merely substituting a 'but,' *sed.*

II 8 § 8. Arm. and Latin omit words: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ Τύρῳ πεπραγμένα κατὰ Ἀθανασίου εἰς μέσον ἦγον.

II 9 § 4 συνέβη Εὐστάθιον ὑπὸ Κύρου κατηγορηθέντα τοῦ Βεροιέως καθαιρεθῆναι ὡς Σαβελλίζοντα.

Arm. adds words equivalent to: μετ' οὐ πολὺ δε κἀκεῖνον κατηγορεῖν τὸν Κῦρον ὡς τὰ Σαβελλίου φρονοῦντα (or Σαβελλίζοντα).

These words have dropped out of the Greek texts through homoioteleuton; Socrates himself (I 24) records on the authority

of George of Laodicea that Cyrus in turn was deposed on the same charge: *αὖθις τὸν Κῦρον ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἁλόντα καθῃρῆσθαι φησί.*

II 10 § 2 *τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς ἐπὶ καθαιρέσει καὶ παρατροπῇ τῆς ὁμοουσίου πίστεως διὰ τοῦ συνεχεῖς ποιεῖσθαι συνόδους.*

Codex Allatii has *ἀρχὴν δὲ παρεσχηκότες ὑποθέσεως τοῦ συνεχεῖς κτλ.*

So Arm. and Old Latin: *sed principium praebentes ut....* The Arm. expresses *ὑποθέσεως* more clearly than the Latin. All three sources omit the words *ἐπὶ καθ. καὶ παρ. τῆς ὁμ. π.*

ibid. ὥστε κατὰ βραχὺ εἰς τὴν Ἀρειανὴν δόξαν παρατρέψωσι.

Codex Allatii omits *ὥστε* and then proceeds: *κατὰ βραχὺ τὸ εἰς τὴν Ἀρ. δόξαν ἐκπεσεῖν*, which as Valesius notes is involved by the Latin rendering efficerent ut definitio fidei paullatim in Arianam vesaniam relaberetur. Arm. has same reading as Allatius, only for *τὸ* it read *τε* which is necessary.

II 11 § 1 *τούτων γινομένων καὶ Γρηγόριον κατήγαγον ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Συριανός τε ὁ στρατηγὸς καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ὁπλῖται.*

Valesius remarks: Hoc loco errat Socrates...Georgium quidem Alexandriam deduxit Syrianus...Gregorius vero de quo hic loquitur Socrates, deductus est Alexandriam a Balacio duce et Philagrio praefecto Aegypti, ut scribit idem Athanasius etc.

Arm. reads *ἀπὸ Συρίας* or *ἐκ Σ.* for *Συριανός τε*, which is a possible reading, since it was from Antioch of Syria that Gregory was being sent. It is impossible to suppose that the Armenian translator emended the text. The Latin however has Syrianus magister. Sozomen paraphrasing Socrates merely writes: *ἦκε Γρηγόριος εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν σὺν πλήθει στρατιωτῶν.*

II 12 § 5 *ὢν εἷς ἦν ὁ διὰ Μακεδονίου.* Valesius adopts this reading from the codex Allatii. Arm. also involves it. Latin reads: Interea propter Macedonium ingens praeliorum flamma surgebat and the Greek MSS. are similarly corrupt.

II 13 § 1. Arm. and Latin omit: *μέρη ὁδοῦ πάρεργον ποιῆσαι καὶ.*

II 13 § 6 *ὠργίζετο γὰρ οὐ μόνον περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι παρὰ γνώμην.*

Codex Allatii and Arm. read *ὠργίζετο γὰρ καὶ κατ' αὐτοῦ, οὐ μόνον ὅτι π. γν.* So also Latin: Irascebatur enim etiam illi, non solum quia etc.

II 14 *ὡς μισούμενον ἐν ταὐτῷ δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐμπρησμὸν, καὶ ὅτι ἧττον κτλ.* Valesius suggests *ὡς μισ. διὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκ. ἐμπ. ἐν ταὐτῷ δὲ καὶ ὅτι κτλ.* This the Latin confirms: tanquam odiosum et quia propter eum factum fuisset incendium, necnon et quia minus etc.

Arm. merely omits *δὲ καί*, without which the sentence runs well enough.

ibid. δόξαν δὲ δεινοῦ περὶ τὴν αὐτῶν θρησκείαν ἐκέκτητο.

Here Valesius supplied *δεινοῦ* from Allatius' codex. Latin has simply: hominem Arianae vesaniae. Arm. = et Arianismi haeresin nactus erat. Clearly Arianism was imputed in the text which underlies the Latin and Arm.

II 15 § 8 *ἢ ὅσα αὐτὸς ὁ αἱρεσιάρχης Μακεδόνιος κατὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν διεπράξατο.* Valesius notes that the codex Allatii gives a better reading (longe praeferenda), viz. *αὐτοῦ* (i.e. of Sabinus) for *αὐτὸς* and below *κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.* The first of these is involved by Arm., but not the second.

ibid. εὔφημα ἂν πρὸ τούτων ἐφθέγγετο. Valesius so restored the text from codex Allatii, and Arm. supports it.

II 16 § 1 *δι' ὀργῆς ἐτίθετο τὸ γιγνόμενον. Πρόσταγμα οὖν ἔγγραφον ἀποστέλλει τῷ ἐπάρχῳ Φιλίππῳ.*

The Latin has: iratus sacra sua misit ad Philippum, and Arm. = *δι' ὀργῆς πρόσταγμα ἔγγραφον ἀποστέλλει τῷ ἐπ. Φιλ.* Both versions then reflect a text which omitted *ἐτίθετο τὸ γιγνόμενον* and *οὖν.* It cannot be a coincidence, and points to a difference of recension.

II 16 § 5 *ὡς ἀναγκαῖον ἐλθεῖν παρ' αὐτόν.* Valesius suggests *ὂν* after *ἀναγκαῖον* which (or *εἶναι*) Arm. adds.

II 16 § 6. After *ἐκ φήμης ὑπόπτου* codex Allatii adds *συλλεγέντες* in which Arm. concurs, though it omits the words

added by the same codex in the immediate context, viz. *διὰ τὸ περιεστάναι πάσαις ταῖς ἐξόδοις τὸν δῆμον.*

II 16 § 17. After *μιᾶς τὴν προσωνυμίαν ἔχουσαι* Arm. adds the clause: "for one set of clergy offers in them." But no other source lends colour to this addition.

II 17 § 7. Arm. confirms the reading of codex Allatii adopted on Valesius' recommendation by reading: *ἀντιγράφων ἐπεμέμψατο, πρῶτον μὲν τὸ ἐπαχθὲς τῆς αὐτῶν ἐπιστολῆς.*

II 18 § 2 *Θεόδωρος ὁ Θρᾷξ.* Arm. *Δωρόθεος ὁ Θ.*

II 18 § 8 *ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν υἱὸν ἐδογμάτισε.* Arm. read *Ἰησοῦν* for *υἱόν.*

II 19 § 1 *τριετοῦς δὲ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ διαδραμόντος χρόνου.*

Arm. has *διετοῦς*, but Athanasius signified the same interval of four years 341—345 by the words *μετὰ ἔτη τρία* as Valesius points out.

II 19 § 1 *συνέδριον ποιησάμενοι.*

Arm. had *καθισάμενοι*, which was the technical phrase.

II 19 § 24. Read *ὅλου μὲν τοῦ πατρός*, as Valesius suggests.

II 19 § 26 *παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀδιαστρόφως.* Valesius corrects both from codex Allatii and Athanasius to *παρὰ τοῖς ἀδιαστρόφοις.*

II 20 § 4 *τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν δύο Αὐγούστων.*

Arm.: *τοῦ μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου.*

II 20 § 6. Before *προὐβάλλοντο* Arm. adds: 'Sed orientales episcopi non adfuerunt omnes,' which seems a mere gloss.

II 20 § 12 *Ἀποδιδόασιν οὖν τὸν τόπον τοῖς περὶ Παῦλον καὶ Ἀθανάσιον.*

Arm. has *Εὐσέβιον* for *Παῦλον.* Valesius notes: De Paulo ne verbum quidem ullum exstat in epistola Synodica Concilii Serdicensis.

II 20 § 13 *τότε δὲ ἐν τῷ τὴν καταδίκην ἀναπαλαῖσαι.*

Arm. has *τότε δὲ ἐν Σαρδικῇ ἐν τῷ κτλ.* The words dropped out through homoioteleuton.

II 21 § 8. As Valesius points out, there has fallen out before the words *τῶν τε πολλῶν γεννητῶν* an entire clause

of Eusebius' treatise against Marcellus, namely: *ταύτῃ γὰρ ἀδελφὸς ἂν τούτων γένοιτο μᾶλλον, οὐχὶ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, which subsequent editors have not troubled themselves to replace, any more than they have corrected *γεννητῶν* and *γέννητον* into *γενητῶν* and *γενητόν*; though Eusebius so wrote and the sense demands they should be read. The same editors in the next section 9 have allowed the monstrous reading *προηγούμενον* to remain, although Valesius pointed out that *προηγμένον* stood in Eusebius' text.

II 23 § 7 *ἐπὶ τῷ ἀμφοτέρων ἡμῶν ἐπινευσάντων τῇ πατρίδι ἀποκατασταθῆς ἔχων τοῦτο τῆς ἡμῶν χάριτος ἐνέχυρον.*

Here *ἐπὶ τῷ* requires an infinitive verb. Latin has: ut ambobus nobis annuentibus, restitutus in patria, habeas maximum gratiae nostrae pignus. Therefore read *ἀποκατασταθεὶς ἔχειν.*

II 23 § 8 *διὰ τὸ μάλιστα βουλεύεσθαι ἡμᾶς.* Latin has: eo quod maxime velimus te. Therefore read *βούλεσθαι ἡμᾶς* which, as Valesius remarked, *apud Athanasium rectius legitur.*

ibid. τὰ γράμματα πρὸς τὴν σὴν στερρότητα δεδηλώκαμεν.

Latin has: has literas ad tuam misimus sanctitatem. Therefore read *δεδώκαμεν* which Athanasius also read.

II 23 § 15. This letter of Julius, like nearly all the other letters and documents introduced in his text by Socrates, is omitted in the Armenian. But the Latin version, codex Allatii and other sources enable us to remove several corruptions, e.g. in the title read: *Ἰούλιος ἐπίσκοπος πρεσβυτέροις.* In § 18 read: *τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀγάπης* (for *αὐτάς*). In § 24 *κατά τε γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν πολλὰ χειμασθείς* (for *πειρασθείς*, Latin plurimum aestuans). In § 27 *παρ' ἁπάσης τῆς συνόδου ἀποδειχθείς* (for *ἀποδεχθείς*). *Ibidem* read: *τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὑμῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς Ἀθανάσιον μετὰ τούτου καὶ οἵ τινες αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν τοσούτων καμάτων κοινωνοὶ γεγόνασι*, where the common texts omit *ὡς ἀληθῶς* and *καὶ τῶν τοσούτων καμάτων* and have *μετὰ τούτων* and *αὐτῶν.*

All these emendations are supplied in Valesius' notes, yet neglected by Oxford and Cambridge editors.

II 23 § 34 *διακρινόμενοι τὴν πρός σε κοινωνίαν.* Valesius suggests *πρὸς* before *τὴν* which Arm. favours.

II 23 § 38 *γνώμην λυσιτελῆ.* Latin has *inutilem* and Valesius suggests *ἀλυσιτελῆ.* Arm. in order to make sense interprets *λυσιτελῆ* 'in order to their dissolution.'

II 23 § 50. Read *τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐν ἅπασιν εὐνομίαν.* Latin has *nostrae* aequitatis intentionem. In the sequel the editors in spite of Valesius' notes have retained in § 53 *εὐχάς* for *ἀκοάς.*

II 24 § 3 *τοῖς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ ἐπισκόποις.*
Latin and Arm. add: clericis atque plebi.

II 25 § 10 *τοῦ Κωνσταντίου γὰρ ἀδελφιδοῦς ἦν.* Arm. involves *Κωνσταντίνου,* conjectured by Valesius.

II 26 § 1 *κατὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Σεργίου καὶ Νιγριανοῦ.* Arm. reads *Νιγρινιανοῦ.* In Idatius also we have Sergio et Nigriniano Coss.

II 26 § 9 *Πλάκιτον.* Arm. and Latin have Phlacitus, which is half-way between *Placitus* and Flacillus.

II 28 § 3 *γέγονε τὰ ὕστερα χείρονα.*
Arm. = *γέγ. χείρονα τὰ νῦν* which stands in Athanasius' text, *Apologia de Fuga,* c. 6.

II 28 § 4 *ἡρπάζοντο οἰκίαι τε καὶ ἄρτοι.* Arm. Latin and citation by Theodoret omit *καὶ ἄρτοι.*

II 28 § 8 *οἷα παρ' αὐτῶν ἔπρεπε πραχθῆναι.* Athanasius' text adds *ἀκούσαντα* after *ἔπρεπε.* Arm. adds *ἀκούσαντας* which comes to the same thing.

II 28 § 11 *καὶ τὴν παρθένον ἐξώρισαν.* Arm. has *τὰς παρθένους* with Theodoret. Latin *quandam virginem.*

II 28 § 12 *μεῖζον ἐξηχεῖτο κατ' αὐτῶν ὁ τῆς ἀσεβείας καὶ ὠμότητος ἔλεγχος.*
Arm. has *ἐξεχεῖτο* or *ἐξέχυτο.*

II 28 § 13 *Θμοῦϊν.* Latin muium. In Athanasius' text also *μούϊον.* The Arm. omits the list of names.

ibid. δρακόντιον, ἀδέλφιον, ἀμμώνιον ἕτερον καὶ ἕτερον μάρκον.

Latin omits *ἀμμ. ἕτ. κ. ἕτ. μ.* Athanasius' text is deranged. It has *ἕτερον μάρκον, δρακόντιον, ἀδέλφιον, ἀθηνόδωρον.*

II 28 § 14 *ἐφυγάδευσαν δὲ ἐπισκόπους.*

Latin has occiderunt i.e. *ἐφόνευσαν.* So also Theodoret, *quod verius puto* says Valesius without having observed that it stood in the old Latin. *mendosam esse arbitramur* (lectionem) write the Benedictine editors of Athanasius who also had not noticed the old Latin testimony. The error must have arisen early in the tradition of Socrates, but is not original to it for Arm. involves *ἐφυγάδευσαν.*

II 28 § 21 *τῇ Ἀντιοχέων.* Arm. has *τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ,* which is surely an error.

II 29 § 5 *οἱ δὲ ἐπιμείναντες ἔπραξαν ὅπερ οὐ πᾶσιν ἦν ἄριστον.* Valesius suggests *ἀρεστόν* which Arm. involves. The words *ὅπερ οὐ κτλ.* are contained in the codex Sfortianus and Arm. alone.

II 30 § 3. Arm. and Latin omit the words *τῇ ὑπὸ Μάρκου συντεθείσῃ συζεύξας.*

ibid. Arm. retains *ἐν Σιρμίῳ ἀνέγνωσαν,* though the Latin more correctly reads *in Arimino.*

II 30 § 16. After *υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσταυρωμένον ἀκούων* the codex Allatii adds *τὴν θεότητα αὐτοῦ* which, though Hilary read it also as Valesius points out, the later editors have omitted. In the Latin it is wanting, but it must have stood in the Gangra copy of Socrates used by Theodorus Lector. The same editors retain the absurd reading *κατῆλθεν εἰς σῶμα* for *κατ. εἰς σόδομα*; but as Epiphanius here has *descendit in corpus* and Valesius passes over it, they had more excuse.

II 30 § 41 *καὶ ἀναδείξῃ.*

καὶ ἀναδιδάξῃ should be read as Valesius points out.

II 30 § 42 *συμπείθειν ἐπειρῶντο.*

Arm. involves *συμπ. ἐπῄροντο.* Latin *suadebant. ἐπαίρω* in the active bears the sense of *persuade,* and in Socrates' Greek this sense would pass over to the middle voice.

II 30 § 44 *βασίλειος.* So Arm. Latin has Sabinus, who was never, so far as is known, bishop of Ancyra.

II 30 § 45 *λόγον συνέγραψεν.* Latin has libros and codex Allatii *λόγους.* Arm. involves *προλόγους.*

II 30 § 48 *παρὰ τῶν ἐγγραψαμένων.*
Latin: qui eam iam subscripserant, wherefore correct to *ὑπογραψαμένων.* The verb *ἐγγράφω* is hardly appropriate of *subscribing* to a creed.

II 32 § 6 *ᾧ ὄνομα Μιλτοσέλευκος.* Arm. montoseleucus. So Latin montem Seleucum. Codex Allatii *μοντοσέλευκος.*

II 32 § 9 *Δεκένιος ὄνομα αὐτῷ.* Latin has *Decentios.* Arm. *Centios*, having it seems mistaken the *Δε* for the particle *δέ.*

II 32 § 11. Arm. omits the words *περὶ τὴν Γαλλίαν.* The Latin sets them just above after *μετὰ ταῦτα γὰρ εὐθύς.*

II 34 § 2 *ἀνεῖλε μηνύσαντας τῷ βασιλεῖ τὸν σκόπον αὐτοῦ.* This text is from codex Allatii, which Arm. confirms.

II 34 § 5 *ὑπατείᾳ Ἀρβιτίωνος καὶ Λολλιανοῦ.* Arm. reads Juliani, as also the Latin.

II 34 § 7 *ἐπὶ τὴν Γαλλίαν σπεύδειν.*
Arm., codex Allatii and Sozomen have *ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν* here, which Valesius also commends.

II 35 § 4 *καὶ πρότερον Ἀέτιος αἱρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος....*
And § 14 *παιδευθεὶς τὴν αἱρετικὴν λέξιν.* In the one passage Arm. renders *ἐριστικός* and in the other *ἐριστικήν*, and these must be the genuine readings for in § 10 we read of Aetius: *τὸ ἐριστικὸν δὲ κατωρθώκει μόνον*, and in § 14 the codex Allatii has preserved *ἐριστικήν.* In the latter passage Arm. also rather favours than not the reading of the same codex *λεσχήν* for *λέξιν.*

II 35 § 9 *ὅπως τὸ γενόμενον συναΐδιόν ἐστι τῷ γεννήσαντι.*
Arm. involves *γεννώμενον*, which Valesius conjectured.

II 37 § 7 *τὸν αἱρετικὸν Ἀέτιον.*
Arm. involves *ἐριστικόν* as before.

ibid. κατὰ τὴν Ῥώμην ἐπείγεσθαι σκέπτεται.
Latin: fixit sibi causam necessitatis incumbere. Therefore read *σκήπτεται.*

II 37 § 91 *τῶν περὶ Οὐρσάκιον.*

Arm. adds *καὶ Οὐάλεντα.*

II 37 § 94 *ταῦτα ἐγένετο βίᾳ καὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν προσταγμάτων.*

Valesius suggests *ἐκ* before *τῶν.* Arm. read *βίᾳ τῶν* omitting *καὶ* which may be a dittology of *βίᾳ.*

II 38 § 3 *τοῦ οἰκείου σκοποῦ.*

Latin: proprii languoris, as if *παθοῦς* or some similar corruption had stood in the text.

II 38 § 20 *προφέροντες ἔκαιον.*

Arm. *προσφέροντες,* which Valesius conjectured.

II 38 § 11 *παρὰ τοῦ μακροχρονιωτάτου αὐξάνοντος ἤκουσα.*

Arm. involves the name *Auxanon,* but codex Allatii has *αὔξωνος,* and the Latin calls him *Auxonius.* Auxanôn seems the right form, as it comes elsewhere in Socrates.

II 38 § 26 *ἐν τοῖς εὐκτηρίοις ἔχεσθαι.* Arm. has *εὔχεσθαι.* 'Omnino scribendum est *εὔχεσθαι.* quod miror a Christophorsono animadversum non fuisse' writes Valesius. However the solecism is repeated by modern editors.

II 38 § 31 *ἀνδραποδισμοί.*

Latin oddly renders *sollicitationes.*

II 38 § 34 *ἦσαν οὖν διὰ τοῦτο οἵ τε εἰσπορευόμενοι καὶ οἱ προσεδρεύοντες καὶ εὐχόμενοι ἐν φόβῳ πολλῷ.*

The natural sense is that not only the guards but those who entered the church to say their prayers were intimidated, and so Latin has: Ideoque custodes ejus et qui ad orationem intrabant, erant positi sub timore.

The Greek should therefore run: *ἦσαν οὖν διὰ τοῦτο οἵ τε προσεδ. καὶ οἱ εἰσπορ. καὶ εὐχ. κτλ.* That Arm. omits *οἵ τε εἰσπορ. καί,* points to a line having got into the margin and been put back into the wrong place.

ibid. ὅπως ἂν μὴ συληθῇ ἡ θήκη ὑπὸ τοῦ πτώματος.

Latin has: ne arcam ruinae casus comprimeret, and Arm. also implies *συλληφθῇ.* The codex Sfortianus has *συληθῇ.*

II 38 *ad finem.* Arm. has the reading of codex Allatii *καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ φρέαρ ὑπερβλύσαι τοῦ αἵματος, ἐκρεῖν δὲ τοῦτο κτλ.*

II 39 § 3 *ὑπατευόντων Τατιανοῦ καὶ Κερεαλίου.* Arm. has the correct form *Datianos* found in the Fasti consulares and Ammianus Marcellinus, also in Libanius, whose friend he was.

ibid. τὴν ὀγδόην εἰκάδα τοῦ Αὐγούστου μηνός. Arm. has 'month of September,' probably by error, and the Latin: octava die mensis Augusti.

II 40 § 9. Arm. transposes the names, as follows: *Καθὼς καὶ ὁ λαμπρότατος Κόμης Λεωνᾶς καὶ Λαυρίκιος ὁ ἡγούμενος τῆς ἐπαρχίας αὐτοψίᾳ.* So also Latin and Epiphanius who in ch. 25 of his 'Heresy of the Semiarians' cites this profession of faith in full.

II 40 § 43 *Οὐρσάκιον τύρου.*

Arm. Uranium Tyri with Latin version and text of Athanasius, as Valesius notes.

II 41 § 1 *καὶ τότε τὸν ἔπαρχον τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατέστησεν.*

Arm. *καὶ τότε πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον τῆς κτλ. πρῶτον* for *τόν* is as certainly right as *ἐπίσκοπον* for *ἔπαρχον* is wrong. Sozomen iv 23 has *πρῶτον ὕπαρχον Κωνσ. ἀπέφηνεν.*

II 41 § 5 *συνέδριον ἕτερον πεποιήκασι.*

Arm. renders *ἐκάθισαν* which is the technical term.

II 41 § 22 *μετὰ τῆς προσθήκης ἐκδίδοται.*

Arm. implies *ἀνεγνώκεισαν* for *ἐκδίδοται.* So Latin: cum adjectione recitata est.

II 42 § 5 *ὡς ἀδίκως τινὰ βασανίσαντα.*

Arm. involves *τινάς*, which may be right as in the next clause it is alleged against Basilius *ὅτι συκοφαντίας τισὶν ἔρραψεν.*

II 42 § 6 *Ἐλπίδιον Σατάλων τῆς Μακεδονίας.*

There was no such city in Macedonia, wherefore Valesius conjectured *Ἀρμενίας.*

Arm. supplies the true reading *Καππαδοκίας* of which *Μακεδονίας* is an easy corruption.

II 43 § 17 *τοῦτο μὲν οὖν τοιοῦτο τέλος.*

Codex Allatii has *τότε* for *τοῦτο*, and so also Arm.

II 44 § 4 *διδασκαλίαν τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς προσήκειν.* For *προσήκειν* Valesius conjectured either *παρεῖχεν* or *προσῆγεν*, of which Arm. confirms the latter, for it = adferebat.

II 44 § 6 *Μελέτιον.* Arm. here renders the longer form of the name *Melitianos*, but elsewhere *Melitios*, which, as it is given in Gregory Nazianzen, Valesius prefers to *Meletios*.

II 45 § 3 *διεκρίθησαν φανερῶς τὸ ὁμοιούσιον ἐδογμάτισαν τὸ πρότερον ἤδη μὲν οὐκ ἐκτρανοῦντες αὐτό.* Arm. sets back the two words *ἤδη μέν* before *φανερῶς*, so restoring the sense and confirming Valesius' conjecture, based on the Latin which runs: declinaverunt, aperte verbum, similis substantiae, sanci-erunt: cum prius hoc non manifesto iudicio declarassent.

II 45 § 12 *ὁ υἱός ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ.*

Codex Allatii omits *ἐκ*: so also Arm.

II 45 § 15 *τῶν τε ἐκκλησιῶν ἐκράτει.*

So codex Allatii followed by Valesius; the other codices supported by Arm. add *ἔτι* before *ἐκράτει.*

ibid. μὴ φρονοῦντας τὰ αὐτοῦ.

Arm. omits *μή* referring *αὐτοῦ* to *Ἀθανασίου* which immediately precedes. If the reference be to George the bishop mentioned before Athanasius the *μή* is needed.

II 45 § 16 *Ἀρρήνιος.* Arm. = Erinios. Codex Allatii has *Ἐρέννιος.* Jerome has the name *Irenios* in his Chronicon.

II 45 § 17 *τότε δὲ καὶ ἑτέρα παρεφύη αἵρεσις ἐξ αἰτίας τοιᾶσδε.*

In Arm. this clause is preceded by another which has dropped out of the Greek clauses: 'This, as I have said, happened afterwards.' *τοῦτο μὲν ὥσπερ εἴρηκα ὕστερον ἐγένετο.* Such a clause is quite in the style of Socrates.

II 46 § 10 *καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἔλεγον ἀναληφθῆναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ἐν τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως ψυχῆς ἄνευ.*

Latin has: et primum quidem dicebant animam a deo uerbo in dispensatione incarnationis non assumptam. Arm. also = *καὶ προτ. μὲν ἔλεγον οὐκ ἀναληφθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θ. λ. κτλ.*

Book III.

III 1 § 3 *ὡς δέον τὸν περὶ τοιούτου λόγον μὴ ἀπολείπεσθαι περὶ οὗ ὁ λόγος.*

The sense is that a discourse about an emperor must come up to its subject-matter in dignity. Therefore Valesius read *τοῦ περὶ οὗ ὁ λόγος* which Arm. confirms.

III 1 § 9 *ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ κατ' αὐτῶν τοῦ βασιλέως ὁρμὴ ἐκεχαύνωτο.*

Latin: cumque ab eis fervor imperatoris quievisset. Arm. also renders *ἐκεχαύνωτο* in sense of *quievisset* which hardly suits the Greek, though the text requires it.

III 1 § 19 *ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῦτα τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἐλάνθανεν.*

Arm. and Latin add *οὐκ* before *ἐλάνθανεν* which the context demands.

ibid. ἐν μέσῳ ἐλπίδος καὶ φόβου ὢν τὴν ὑπόνοιαν ἐκφυγεῖν βουλόμενος.

Arm. adds after *φόβου ὢν* the words equivalent to *κρατήσαντος δὲ φόβου* which may have dropped out through homoioteleuton.

III 1 § 21 *τὴν τοῦ βασίλεως ἐλάνθανεν ὁρμήν.* Latin and Arm. render *ἐλάνθανεν* 'checked' *declinavit*, probably a paraphrase.

III 1 § 23. Arm. renders *ἦκεν* as if *ἦγεν*: wrongly.

III 1 § 26 *τὴν ἀδελφὴν Ἑλένην.* Both Latin and Arm. have *Constantia* for Helena in this chapter.

III 1 § 27 *εἰς οὐδὲν χρήσιμον.* Arm. and Latin involve *χρήσιμοι*, 'cum nihil profuissent,' which Valesius approved.

III 1 § 27 *μισθὸν ὡρισμένον τῷ ἀνελόντι βάρβαρον ὑποσχόμενος.*

Arm. adds: 'And so won a victory over the Barbarians,' which may be a gloss.

III 1 § 29 *λόγος δέ τις ὅτι εἰς ἓν τῶν πολιχνίων.* Arm. adds *ἐν τῇ Γαλλίᾳ* after *ὅτι.*

III 1 § 35 *εἷς τῶν δορυφόρων.*
Latin renders *signiferorum.*

III 1 § 38 *διόπερ αὐτῷ προσετίθεντο.*
Latin adds *plurimi* after *διόπερ.*

III 1 § 38. Both Latin and Arm. omit the clause: *οἵ τε τὴν θρησκείαν ἕλληνες ἑορτὰς ἐπετέλουν ἑλληνικάς*, perhaps wishing to minimise to their readers the revival of Paganism under Julian.

III 1 § 46 *καὶ τοὺς πρωτοτύπους Εὐσεβίου τε τὰς ἁρπαγὰς ἀχθομένους.*
Latin: et praecipue Eusebii rapinis ingemiscentes; so also Arm. Therefore read *πρωτοτύπως* which Evagrius uses in this sense. Also omit *τοὺς* and *τέ.*

III 1 § 50 *καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα Κωνσταντίου βασιλικῶς τιμήσας ἐκήδευσεν.*
For *ἐκήδευσεν* Arm. has exodium fecit, the word *ἐξόδιον* being transliterated as if it had stood in the text and the translator had not understood it. It was a technical term in Byzantine Greek for a grand funeral, thus John Moschus, *Pratum spirituale*, ch. 77, p. 1087 (cited by Suicer) writes *θεωρῶ νεκρὸν ἐξοδιαζόμενον· ἀκολουθῶ οὖν ὀπίσω τοῦ ἐξοδίου.* 'I see the corpse being carried forth; I follow therefore in the wake of the cortège.' Perhaps Socrates wrote *ἐξωδίασε* to signify a more solemn funeral than *ἐκήδευσε* would imply. See below III 26 § 1.

III 1 § 50 *διὰ τὸ ἀποβεβληκέναι τὴν γαμετήν.* So Arm. Latin had *διὰ τὸ ἀποβεβηκέναι τ. γ.* for it renders: quia ejus uxor obierat. Arm. also renders *τὴν γαμετὴν αὐτοῦ Κωνσταντίαν.*

III 1 § 56 *βριάζοντας.* Read *βρυάζοντας*, Latin *confluentes.*

III 1 § 57 *ἐκωμῴδησεν.*
Latin *laceravit*: Arm. by a misunderstanding renders *ἐνεκωμίασεν.*

III 2 § 1 *ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν γενομένων χρόνον.* Arm. perhaps involves *αὐτοῦ.*

III 2 § 5 *νέων τε καὶ παλαίων.*

Arm. = Latin: maiorum pariter et infantium, as if *παλαίων τε καὶ νέων* had stood.

III 2 § 7 *διὰ πάσης ἐπιβουλῆς ἀνεῖλον.*

Arm. had *δ. π. ἰδέας θανάτου* with codex Florentinus and probably with Latin which renders: diversis vulneribus.

III 3 § 3 *ἐφάνη δὲ γεώργιος.*

Arm. renders *καὶ φαίνεται δὲ γ.* as read in the codex Florentinus.

III 3. In this chapter modern editors have neglected to incorporate in the text several emendations pointed out in Valesius' notes; e.g. § 7 *τοῖς παραχρῆμα βεβουλευμένοις* for *τῆς π. βεβουλευμένης.*

§ 12 *παρεφύλαττεν, εἰ μετριώτερον* for *παρεφύλαττεν. Εἰς μετρ.*

§ 21 for *τὸν πάππον τὸν ἐμόν* read *τὸν π. τὸν θεῖον τὸν ἐμόν.*

§ 22 *οὔποτε ἂν δήμου περιίδοιεν* for *οὔπ. ἂν δ. περιιδεῖν.*

§ 24 *τὰ νῦν ἔτι, τῆς εὐγενείας* for *τὰ νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς εὐγ.*

§ 25 *προτεθήτω* for *προστεθήτω.*

III 6 § 2 *Ἀντιόχειαν.* Arm. has *Ἀλεξάνδρειαν* apparently by error. Similarly it adds in § 3 at end of chapter after *ἀπεχώρει* the words Lucifer Antiocheiam.

III 7 § 2 *τὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα.* Arm. adds *ἐκ θεοῦ λόγον.* Latin has *verbum* inhumanatum as if both translators added *λόγον.*

III 7 § 5 *ὡς ὁμολογούμενον αὐτοῖς φάσκουσιν.* Arm. omits *αὐτοῖς* of which Valesius notes: ultima vox delenda esse mihi videtur, utpote ex superiore linea ab oscitante librario repetita.

III 7 § 6 *Βήρυλλον τὸν Φιλαδελφίας.* Arm. confirms this reading which Valesius introduced. The earlier editions had *Κύριλλον* for *Βήρυλλον.*

III 7 § 15. Arm. involves *ἕκαστον τῶν ὀνομαζομένων,* which Valesius restored from the Florentine codex. Nicephorus read *ὀνομάτων.*

III 7 § 17 *οἱ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν παρ' Ἕλλησι σοφίαν ἐκθέμενοι.* Latin omits *παρ' Ἕλλησι* and renders *Ἑλληνικήν* by *graecanicam.* Arm. renders it as if *λογικήν* had stood, or *ἐλλόγιμον* which in Byzantine writers (e.g. Sozomen Hist. v 13) often means 'eloquent,' *disertus.*

Valesius notes that one or the other is superfluous, and that Nicephorus omitted *τὴν Ἑλληνικήν.*

III 8 § 3 foll. Arm. as usual omits the long citation of Athanasius. In the text of it various emendations suggested by Valesius have been ignored, although they are peremptory, e.g. § 3 *ἐτύρευσαν* for *ἐτυράννευσαν*, read by Nicephorus and involved by the Latin: contra nos mala sunt machinati.

§ 32 *κἂν ἀκούοντες* for *κατανοοῦντες*, and *ὀφείλουσι* for *θέλουσι.*

III 9 § 1 *τῇ δὲ πρὸς Λουκίφερα αἰδοῖ σιωπήσας ἀνεχώρησεν, ἐπαγγειλάμενος ἐν συνεδρίῳ ἐπισκόπων τὰ γενόμενα διορθώσασθαι.*

Sozomen here as elsewhere copying or paraphrasing Socrates writes:

οὐδὲν εἰς τὸ φανερὸν ἐμέμψατο, Λουκίφερα τιμῶν· οὐδετέρῳ δὲ μέρει κοινωνήσας, ὑπέσχετο τὰ λυποῦντα ἑκατέρους ἐν συνόδῳ διορθώσειν.

Arm. exactly adds the words *οὐδετέρῳ δὲ μέρει κοινωνήσας* in the text of Socrates before *ἀνεχώρησεν*, and there can be no doubt that the Greek copyists have omitted them through homoioteleuton; they probably filled a single line. In the copy used by the Latin translator Epiphanius Scholasticus they were already lost, for he renders *facto silentio discessit.* That the Armenian translator took them from Sozomenus is impossible.

III 9 § 7 *ἐδέδετο γὰρ ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ ἀπολογίαις.* Arm. involves *ὁμολογίαις.* So Latin: erat enim confessionibus suis obstrictus.

ibid. στέρξειν τὰ ὑπὸ τῆς συνόδου τυπούμενα καθυπέσχετο. Arm. implies *στηρίζειν* for *στέρξειν.* Latin perhaps the same, for it renders *ratum se habiturum.* It has however used

the same phrase in III 6 § 2 to render *στέρξειν*, which Arm. there omits.

III 10 § 1 *ἐπισκόποις*. Arm. *τόποις*, perhaps mere paraphrase. Latin has *episcopis*.

III 10 § 2 *δι' ὧν ἱκανῶς μὲν τούτῳ συνέστη*. Arm. = *δι' ὧν ἱκ. μὲν τούτοις* (viz. *τὰ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου δόγματα* of the previous clause) *συνίστη τὴν ἀληθῆ πίστιν*.

III 10 § 2 *τῶν Ἀρειανῶν δογμάτων καθήψατο*. After *δογμάτων* Arm. adds: et impias eorum haereses—probably a gloss.

III 10 § 6 *ἐν τῷ πρὸ τούτου βιβλίῳ πεποιήμεθα μνήμην*. Arm. adds: 'setting forth firmly all that took place therein,' which does not seem to be a mere gloss.

III 10 § 7 *ἐνόσουν*. Arm. renders *ἐν οἷς νῦν*, a good example of the perils for a careless but literal translator of a text in which the words were not divided.

III 10 § 11 *τοὺς φρονοῦντας τὸ ὁμοούσιον*. Arm. renders *ὁμοφρονοῦντας*.

III 11 § 2 *ὑπὸ Εὐζωίου*. Arm. *ὑπὸ Ἐλευσίου*, as conjectured by Valesius.

ibid. εἰς ἔδαφος καθαιρεθεῖσαν οἰκοδομηθῆναι κελεύει. Arm. = He ordered (the church) destroyed by Eleusius to be *at once re-built without requisition*.

The last words would answer to *ἄνευ χρείας* or *ἄνευ χρειῶν*. Sozomen using this passage of Socrates (v 5, p. 489 ed. Valesius) has *ἀνοικοδομῆσαι*, so far confirming Arm.

III 11 § 3 *τὰ μὲν ἱερὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ὡς ἔφην, ἠνέῳκτο*. Arm. renders 'he instantly rebuilt,' perhaps a paraphrase.

III 12 § 3. Arm. omits *Γαλιλαῖον γὰρ εἰώθει ὁ Ἰουλιανὸς καλεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς Γαλιλαίους*. Sozomenus in copying the passage (v 4, p. 487) also omits them, and they may well be a gloss.

III 12 § 7 *Διωγμὸν δὲ λέγω, τὸ ὁπωσοῦν ταράττειν τοὺς ἡσυχάζοντας. Ἐτάραττε δὲ ὧδε· νόμῳ ἐκέλευε Χριστιανοὺς παιδεύσεως μὴ μετέχειν*.

After *ἡσυχάζοντας* Arm. adds *τοὺς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐλπίζοντας* which may have dropped out owing to similar ending. Arm. also adds *τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς* before *παιδεύσεως*, implying that it was specially Pagan instruction of which Julian deprived the Christians.

III 13 § 2 *λέγων ὡς κελεύει νόμος.*

After *κελεύει* Arm. adds *ἴδιος Χριστιανῶν*, which hardly seems to be a gloss.

III 13 § 4 *Ἐν τούτοις ἦσαν Ἰοβιανὸς Οὐαλεντινιανός τε καὶ Οὐάλης, οἱ καὶ ὕστερον βασιλεύσαντες.*

After *Οὐάλης* Arm. adds these words: qui quamvis non credebat, quomodo in sequenti narrabimus, de Valente.

In the sequel, IV ch. 1, Socrates only states that Valens was an Arian, not that he was ever a pagan, and perhaps that is the meaning of these additional words, which must surely have been part of the Greek text used by the Armenian translator, perhaps a marginal gloss from Socrates' own hand.

ibid. ἐπὶ μὲν Κωνσταντίου διαπύρως χριστιανίζειν ὑπεκρίνατο· ἐπὶ δὲ Ἰουλιανοῦ γοργὸς Ἕλλην ἐφαίνετο.

After *ὑπεκρίνατο* Arm. adds words equivalent to *καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀρειανὸς ὤν*, which must certainly have stood in the Greek text.

III 13 § 4 *ὅσοι τὰ χρήματα.*

Arm. prefixes *ἤ* which is wanted.

III 13 § 10 *Τηνικαῦτα καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες τῶν Χριστιανιζόντων κατέτρεχον.*

So Latin: Tunc ergo Pagani Christianos graviter oppresserunt. But after *τηνικαῦτα* Arm. adds a sentence which certainly stood in his Greek, viz.:

And then was fulfilled the true proverb of Solomon, that a king in need of money is a great calumniator (*or* greatly unjust). Even so, etc.

I cannot find the passage in Proverbs.

III 13 § 12 *κατά τε τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις καὶ κατὰ τὰς Ἀθήνας.*

Arm. has *καὶ μάλιστα κατὰ τὰς Ἀθήνας* which the sense requires.

III 14 § 3 *ἐπεὶ δὲ πλησίον τῶν διωκόντων οἱ πρὸ μικροῦ φεύγοντες ἦσαν, οὐδὲν οἱ ζητοῦντες ἠρώτων τοὺς περὶ Ἀθανάσιον ἤ που Ἀθανάσιον τεθέανται.*

The incident is taken from Rufinus *Hist. Eccles.* I 34, and is that of Athanasius adroitly doubling and so misleading the emissaries of Julian who were pursuing him. Athanasius turns and meets them, and tells them that he has just passed the fugitive and that if they hurry on they will overtake him. He himself returns to Alexandria, having tricked them by the manœuvre.

Valesius saw that *οὐδὲν* in the above text is intolerable: inepta est ac superflua, and he remarks that Nicephorus omits it in copying the story from Socrates.

Arm. however supplies *νοοῦντες* or some similar word after *οὐδὲν*, the sense being that the pursuers without the least suspicion that Athanasius was the man before them asked him whether he had seen himself on the road. Rufinus wrote ille (i.e. the Count sent in pursuit) qui nullo genere suspicari posset in occursu sibi venire quem quaereret, and Socrates curtails this into *οὐδὲν νοοῦντες*. Just below Arm. had *εἴ που* conjectured by Valesius for *ἤ που*.

III 15 § 1 *ἄρχων ἦν*. Valesius would remove *ἦν* or substitute *ὤν*. Arm. omits it.

III 15 § 6 *τοὺς ἄνδρας τέλος ἐσχάραις ἐπιθεὶς καὶ πῦρ ταύταις ἐπιτεθῆναι κελεύσας.*

Arm. had *ὑποτεθῆναι* which is needed, for you light a fire under a gridiron and not upon it.

III 16 § 3 *δραματικῶς*. Arm. renders *γραμματικῶς* by error. In this chapter are several similar blunders, e.g. *ἀπέβη* for *ἀπέσβη* in § 6, *ἁπάντων* for *ἀπαντῶν* in § 7, *παρέχουσιν* rendered as dative plural of the participle in § 17, *ἄλλως* as *ἀλλ' ὡς* in § 20, *ὅ τε* as *ὅτε ibidem*, *ἀπεσφάλησαν* as *cavebant* in § 26, and in ch. 18 § 1 *χρισμόν* 'anointing' for *χρησμόν*, ch. 19 § 9 *βασιλέων* for *βασάνων*, ch. 16 § 26 *ἐκπονούντων κατάγνωσιν* for *ἐκείνων κατάγνωσιν*.

III 16 § 11 *τὴν ἀμαθίαν αὐτῶν ἀνατρέποντες.*

Arm. renders *ἀθεότητα* for *ἀμαθίαν*.

III 17 § 2 *μὴ στοχασάμενος τοῦ καιροῦ.*
Arm. seems to add *τῆς στενοχωρίας.*

III 17 § 4 Arm. has the order *μὴ μελλήσαντες εἰς ὕβρεις κατὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐχώρησαν.*

III 19 § 11 *οὐδέν μοι δεήσει πρεσβείας.*
Arm. adds the words: And thus he dismissed the envoys.

III 21 § 1 *εἰς τὴν τῶν Περσῶν ἐνέβαλλε μικρὸν πρὸ τοῦ ἔαρος.*
The Armenian translator familiar with the climate of Persia renders 'a little before the beginning of the cold wind.'

III 21 § 14 *δι' εὐπαιδευσίαν κενόδοξος.*
Arm. *δι' εὐδοξίαν κενόδ.* which is more pointed.

III 22 § 6 *Ζημιωθεὶς γὰρ τοὺς Σύρους τῆς ἀρχῆς.*
Valesius notes: non dubito quin hoc loco pro *τοὺς Σύρους* scribendum sit *τοὺς ὅρους*, which Arm. involves.

III 22 § 9 *ἐπιτάφιον ἔγραψεν.*
Arm. *ἐπέγραψεν*, which is better.

III 23 § 1 *αἰ τὸν.* Arm. renders *αἴτιον* by error.

III 23 § 3 *ἐπίσταμαί τε.*
Valesius would write *δέ*, which Arm. favours.

III 23 § 8 *πάλαι γὰρ τὰς βίβλους ἐπίστατο.*
Arm. renders 'repellebat' as if the translator read *ἀφίστατο* for *ἐπίστατο.*

ibid. ἐλέγχων ἰσχύϊ.
Arm. *ἐλέγχειν ἰσχύει* or *ἐλέγχων ἰσχύει.*
Latin has redarguens praevaluerit.

ibid. τὰ καλῶς ἑαυτοῖς ἠσφαλισμένα.
Arm. *τὰ κ. ἐν αὐταῖς ἠσφ.* which Valesius conjectured.

III 23 § 15 *ἀπόχρη ταῦτα εἰς παράστασιν τοῦ ἤθους.*
Arm. *παραίτησιν* for *παράστασιν*, not rightly.

III 23 § 20 *τῆς ἐπιδημίας.* Arm. *τῆς ἀποδημίας.* But Latin renders *adventus.*

III 23 § 22 *οὐδενὸς γὰρ ἐδόκει μοι σημεῖον εἶναι χρηστοῦ.*
Arm. read *οὐδέν.* Latin nullum...signum.

III 23 § 25 *τὰ δὲ ἐγκαταλέξαντες.*
Latin *alia permutantes*, so also Arm.

III 23 § 28 *συνείρας.* Arm. *συναίρας* by error.

III 23 § 29 *γέμουσιν οἱ λόγοι περὶ αὐτοῦ βλασφημίας.*
Arm. and Latin have *περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ* for *περὶ αὐτοῦ*, which makes better sense.

III 23 § 33 *τῶν ἐν Χριστιανοῖς ἁπλουστέρων δεχομένων.*
Arm. *ἁπλούστερον* as conjectured by Valesius.

III 23 § 34 *τὰ καλῶς αὐτῷ νοούμενα.*
Arm. read *αὐτοῖς*. Valesius conjectured *ἄλλοις*, but the Latin *quae magis bene intellexerunt* confirms Arm.

III 23 § 39 *κατέλευσαν.* Arm. *κατέλυσαν.*

III 23 § 49 *Ὃν Ζεὺς ἀρίσταις γοναῖς ἔσπειρεν.*
Arm. has *ἀρρήτοισι* for *ἀρίσταις* which better suits the metre and was conjectured by Valesius. Latin renders *heroum* which cannot be reconciled with the metre.

III 23 § 51 *ἐν θυσίαις τιμᾶτ'.*
Arm. *ὃν θ. τ.* as conjectured by Valesius and rendered by Latin.

III 23 § 53 *ὁ Ἀδρίας.* Arm. *ὁ Ἀνδρίας* as read in the Florentine codex.

III 24 § 2 *τοῦτο δὲ πᾶσιν εἰρηκὼς προέκρινε.*
Arm. has *εἰρηνικῶς* for *εἰρηκώς* which agrees with the context, for the *ὁμούσιον* divided men least.

III 24 § 5 *κατεχρήσαντο.*
Arm. adds a sentence equivalent to *ἐν τοιαύτῃ οὖν καταστάσει ἦν τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων.* It also renders *κατεχρίσαντο*, 'anointed themselves,'—a possible variant, if the reference be to the *taurobolia*, as Valesius thought.

III 25 § 1 *προελεύσεις ἐποίουν.*
Arm. and Latin (adibant crebro) involve *προσελεύσεις ἐπ.* Already conjectured by Valesius.

III 25 § 3 *πασίνικος Ζήνων.*
Arm. and Latin give *Ζήλων* as the name of the diocese.

III 26 § 1 *ἐπὶ τῇ κηδεία.* Arm. renders *ἐπὶ τῷ ἐξοδίῳ* transliterating the word as before, III 1 § 50.

III 26 § 2 *αὖθις.* Arm. *εὐθύς* as conjectured by Valesius.

III 26 § 4. *τά τε δημοσίᾳ καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.*

Arm. *τά τε δημόσια καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐκ.* as involved by Latin (Res Romanae publicae et simul ecclesiasticae), and conjectured by Valesius.

III 26 § 6 *μηνῶν πέντε.*

Arm. = months three and a half.

The third book of Socrates begins with a mention of the death of Constantius A.D. 361, November 3, and ends with that of Jovian A.D. 364, February 17. That makes almost exactly two years, three and a half months. So Arm. is correct.

The collation made by Leo Allatius of the text of Theodorus Lector only covers the first two books of Socrates. Bidez has shewn that Theodorus worked in exile at Gangra. The Armenian version was probably made in Byzantium; how carelessly it was made we may infer from such errors as the following:

I 1 § 2 *κατ' ἀριθμόν* for *κατ' Ἄρειον.*

I 1 § 4 *ὡς οἴεσθαι* for *ὡς οἷόν τε.*

I 2 § 1 *ἐπηλλάξαντο* for *ἐπανείλοντο.*

ibid. *δεκάδι τοῦ Ἰουλίου* for *εἰκάδι τ. Ἰ.*

I 19 § 3 *κατὰ λέξιν* for *καταλέξων.*

I 19 § 7 *ἐπὶ υἱῷ κομιδῇ νηπίῳ* rendered 'for his son Komidenius.'

I 31 § 4 *τότε κοινόν* for *τό τε κοινόν.*

II 2 § 3 *πεπραγμένον* for *γεγραμμένον.*

II 6 § 3 *οἱ μὲν ἐβούλοντο...οἱ δέ* for *εἰ μὲν βούλοιντο...εἰ δέ.*

II 13 § 3 *εὑρόντες* for *σύραντες.*

II 16 § 6 *δήσας* for *δείσας.*

passim *μελήσαντες* for *μελλήσαντες.*

Nevertheless it has a value as reflecting a MS. which was free from many lacunae which run through all the other MSS.

It often joins hands across all the Greek MSS. with Athanasius, and sometimes agrees with the old Latin against the codices used by Valesius. It was also closely allied to the codex Allatii; the latter was not strictly speaking a codex of Socrates at all, but a tripartite history like the Latin work of Epiphanius, compiled before 500, from the Greek histories of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret. A MS. of it exists in the Marciana at Venice, but, so far as I know, has never been published.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

THE PHILLIPPS MANUSCRIPTS OF JUVENAL.

There are two manuscripts of Juvenal in the Phillipps library at Cheltenham, which I have collated lately at the residence of the present owner Mr T. Fenwick, the grandson of Sir Thomas Phillipps. I desire to acknowledge Mr Fenwick's great courtesy to me during my stay at Cheltenham.

The first manuscript n. 16,395, which I call X, is a small folio written on vellum in Caroline minuscules in the 10th century, probably in Italy, by preference in northern Italy, in the opinion of Mr Madan, who kindly allowed me to consult him on this point. This is a fine specimen of a manuscript accompanied by a commentary: it is enriched by interlinear glosses, and by scholia, which belong to the inferior so-called Cornutus group (see W. Höhler, *Die Cornutus-Scholien zum ersten Buche der Satiren Juvenals*, Leipzig, 1896). The lines on a page average 33: there are illuminated letters at the beginning of each satire and each line. The colour of the illuminations alternates, one line being red or purple, the next green. There is, as far as I could discover, no erased bookmark to suggest whence the manuscript came. It was acquired by Sir Thomas Phillipps from the sale of that eminent thief of manuscripts Libri. It comprises 62 folia.

The scribe and the corrector appear to have known some Greek, for at v. 72 there is by a contemporary hand on the reading 'artokopi' this note 'αρτως κωπως' (panis labor); and at vi. 491 and 494 ψεκας is written in Greek characters. But the knowledge of Greek displayed is limited, for at vi. 195 *ζωὴ καὶ ψυχή* appears as ζωηκαιψχε, with this note at the top of the page 'Zoy kai siche,' in Latin letters (i. uita), and at ix. 37 *αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα κίναιδος* appears as αιτος γλικογ ανδρα κιναιδογ, which is neither sense nor metre.

On p. 1 verso is a Vita of the poet preceded by the following scholium:

Decimi dicebant[ur] apud antiquos a kalendario. uel quo[1] eo nasci contigisset. uel quo[ad][2] aliquem gradum dignitatis eligebant[ur]. hinc ergo et iuuenalis dictus est decimus. Iunii similiter dicebant[ur] a mense quo nascerentur. uel quo dignitatem aliquem sortirentur.

There is a similar scholium in the Vienna manuscript printed in Cramer's *Iuuenalis Commentarii Vetusti*, p. 568.

After this follows the Vita, which corresponds closely with the Vita II *b* (found in several MSS.) printed by Dürr, *Das Leben Juvenals*, p. 23. The new Vita differs in some details, generally for the better, for it clears up obscurities, to show which I subjoin the alternative readings of Dürr's Vita, italicising the words varied in the text. I print the punctuation of the manuscript.

Iuuenalis satyricus aquinates fuit. i [=id est] de aquino oppido. hic suo tempore uidens nimiam luxuriam scribentium proposuit et ipse scribere satyram. in qua nemini pepercit. sed omnium carpsit uitia. Ideo autem hanc materiam scribere uoluit. quia claudii neronis tempore numerositas omnium uitiorum plurimum uiguit. *praecipue luxuria*[3]. Unde cum claudius *audisset*[4]. quod iste sua tempora notasset. fecit eum exulare sub optentu militiae et cum exercitu ad aegyptum *proficiscente*[5] cum direxit. ubi angore et taedio periit. Maxime autem ideo *est damnatus*[6]. quia hos uersus in paridem pantomimum scripsit.

hec scripsit
Quod non dant proceres dabit istrio. tu camerinos
et bareas. tu nobilium magna atria curas[7].

Hic pantomimus delator erat pessimus. et per hoc gratiam *principis obtinuerat*[8]. Cuius factione et hic accusatus. damnatus est.

[1] i.e. quod.
[2] i.e. quod ad.
[3] maxime luxuries *Dürr*.
[4] audiret *Dürr*.
[5] proficiscentem *Dürr*.
[6] damnatus est *Dürr*.
[7] Here in Dürr's Vita follows the line 'praefectos Pelopea facit, Philomela tribunos,' omitted in the Phillipps MS.
[8] obtinuerat principis cum (*sic*) factione *Dürr*.

After the Vita immediately succeeds continuous with it the following, which roughly though not minutely corresponds with a scholium in the Vienna MS. printed by Cramer, p. 569:

Hoc autem opus satyra uocatur. Est autem proprie satyra genus lancis. quod in templum deorum illatum. referciebant ciborum abundantia. Unde et satyra dicta est quasi satura. Hinc ergo et istud carmen uocatum est satyra quod omnium uitia carpat. omniumque conuictus plenum sit.

I add a few specimens of the scholia, which are interesting as showing the style of comment in vogue with the later grammarians.

iii. 112. 'aulam,' the reading of X for 'auiam,' is explained 'i. euertet domum amici sui delatione.'

iii. 218. 'Fęcasianorum. Populi sunt superstitiosi multos deos colentes.'

vi. 34. 'Pusio. Puerum dicit deminutiue. Fuit enim hic usus apud antiquos licitus.'

vi. 37. 'Lateri parcas. Id est quod non eum agas turpiter, quod solent mulieres facere.'

vi. 603. 'Spurcos lacus. Id est quia circa cloacas proici solent infantes furtim concepti.'

vii. 16. 'Gallia. Gallogreciam significat. Traducit autem. i. mittit. Nudo talo quod ait habitum gentis ostendit.'

vii. 60. 'Saeua paupertas. Al. sana. Sanam paupertatem dicit quod sanos faciat. aut sana quia cum familiaribus rebus consulit non cogitur insanire. Dicunt enim nisi insanum poetam esse non posse.' This scholium corresponds with that of the Pithoeanus, which MS. however reads 'maesta.'

vii. 154. Over 'cambre' the interlinear gloss is similar to that in the Pithoeanus 'nomen fabulae incognitae.'

ix. 134. 'Erucis. Id est herba quae comesta in uenerem accendit et sensum acuit.'

x. 295. 'Suam. pulchritudinem uel faciem.'

xi. 139. 'Phenix opterus [fenicopterus X^2 *mg.*] proprium auis quae in fenicia habundat.'

xi. 156. 'Pugillares. Grossiores aptos iam ad incidendum.'

xiii. 141. 'Gallinae filius albae. Vulgare prouerbium. de

his qui se nobiles uolunt uideri. Tu inquit de gallina alba natus es. nos nigra. quia ignobiles sumus.'

xvi. 22. 'Vindicta grauior [*om.* et]. Vt sit maior uindicta quam iniuria.'

The second manuscript n. 7277, which I call R, is a small folio of 56 folia written on vellum in Caroline minuscules in the second half of the 11th century, in the opinion of Mr Madan. The writing is often faded and hard to decipher, and has been sometimes refreshed by a later hand. It has interlinear glosses and scholia, and employs Greek characters for Greek words. It contains 33 lines to the page.

The manuscripts of Juvenal are divided broadly into three groups; the first and best consists of the Montpellier MS. (P), and its cognates, the lemmata (Σ) of the scholia in P, the Aarau fragments (*Arov.*), the Sangallen florilegium (*Sang.*), and the Parisinus 8072 (B); in general agreement with these are the fragments of the 4th century Bobbio palimpsest (*Bob.*). The second class comprises the Parisinus 7900 (G) and Urbinas (V), with which may be roughly grouped the Oxford (O) and Valenciennes (*Val.*) MS.[1] The third class is made up of the numerous MSS. of the Vulgate group (ω). The MSS. of the second class, though frequently agreeing with ω, diverge often from that class, and agree with P and its cognates, or offer sound readings peculiar to themselves. The two Phillipps MSS. agree mainly with the Vulgate (ω) group, but as is the case with many MSS. of Juvenal, both are eclectic; and at times unexpectedly preserve what is clearly the right reading Of the two this is more particularly the case with R.

I will consider first passages where these two MSS. differ and one of them preserves the right reading[2].

[1] See *Classical Quarterly*, VI. 21 foll., where I have described the Valenciennes manuscript no. 410. On B see C. E. Stuart's paper, *Classical Quarterly*, III. 1. Further information from M. Nougaret has been put at my disposal by Mr Stuart's kindness.

[2] In drawing up these lists, besides the copious but unsystematic apparatus of Ruperti, the larger edition of Jahn, the *Apparatus Criticus ad Iuuenalem* of Hosius and my own edition, I have used especially the fourth edition of Bücheler revised by the late Dr F. Leo, which is a model of lucidity. In these will be found the details, too numerous to be here repeated. I adopt from Leo the symbol ϕ to indicate the reading of a portion of the ω class.

1. In the following passages X, often with ϕ, agrees with P and its cognates in giving the right reading against ω.

i. 169 'animo ante tubas' instead of 'animante tuba' ωR. iii. 58 'quae nunc' instead of 'quae non' ωR, which gives the opposite to the meaning required. v. 10 'possit' instead of 'possis' ωR. vi. 46 'nimiam' instead of 'mediam' ωR. Here 'nimiam' is clearly right: excess of blood was supposed to cause madness. Ursidius is mad and therefore must be bled. vi. 474 'pretium curae' instead of 'operae pretium' ωR. vii. 100 'nullo quippe modo' instead of 'namque oblita modi' ωRX^2. vii. 165 'quid do' instead of 'quod do' Rϕ. 'Quid do?' is now accepted. It was a standing phrase: Sen. *Contr.* IX. 3. 11 'quid do ne iudicauerim?' x. 78 'effudit' instead of 'effugit' ωR. xv. 75 'praestant instantibus orbes.' This is nearly right, the real reading is preserved in O, 'praestant instantibus Ombis.' P which has 'praestant' with the rest of the line erased, had this reading no doubt. Here $P^2\omega X^2$R have 'praestantibus omnibus instant.'

2. Occasionally X agrees with ω in giving the right reading against P.

x. 155 'acti' instead of 'actum' PR. See *Classical Quarterly*, VI. 32. xiv. 269 'asiculis.' Here ω have 'a siculis,' R 'siculis,' omitting 'a,' against PV which have 'ac uilis.' Leo's convincing conjecture 'assiculis' is supported by X, which differs from it by a letter only. The money-seeking trader leads a venturesome life aboard ship in a cabin of planks. The contemptuous use of the vulgar word 'assiculus' a diminutive of 'assis (axis)' is characteristic of Juvenal's bold style.

iii. 109

praeterea sanctum nihil et ab inguine tutum.

The words 'et ab' are in an erasure of the length of seven letters. Here a word early dropped out, as is indicated by the reading of P

est neq;
praeterea sanctum nihil abinguine tutum.

'Est neque' supplied above by P^2 is usually accepted. I now think that the reading of ϕ 'est et ab' should be restored: it is indicated by the 'et ab' supplied in X: 'est' may easily have disappeared before 'et.'

3. Passages where R agrees, often with ϕ, with P against ω in giving the right reading.

ii. 30 'reuocabat' for 'reuocarat' ωX. iii. 158 'iuuenesque' for 'iuuenemque' ωX. iii. 246 'tignum' for 'lignum' ωX. iv. 4 'spernatur' for 'aspernatur' ω, 'aspernatus' ϕX. As 'aspernor' is common most editors accept 'aspernatur' or 'aspernatus.' 'Spernor' is quoted only from Fronto, *De eloquent.* p. 144. 4 Naber, 'pietatem spernabere.' But it is a feature of poetic diction, which passed from it into the Vulgar Latin, to use the simple for the compound verb; and the language of Juvenal is tinged with Vulgar Latin to a greater extent than has been generally observed. Thus he uses 'pono' for 'appono' v. 51, 85, 146; xi. 84, 108; 'ponenda' for 'deponenda' iii. 56, cp. xiv. 99; 'posita est' for 'disposita est' vii. 47; 'turbauit' for 'conturbauit' xiv. 94; 'spectanda' for 'expectanda' (so ωRX, and so most editors wrongly) vii. 22; 'stantibus' for 'circumstantibus' vii. 11; 'trahit' for 'contrahit' xiv. 325. It is clear that in 'spernatur,' as in 'spectanda' xiv. 94, we have vestiges of the Vulgar Latin which must not be eliminated.

viii. 66 'trito ducunt' for 'tritoque ducunt' ωX, which is unmetrical. viii. 224 'hae sunt' for 'illae sunt' ωX. x. 102 'uacuis' for 'uacuisque' ωX. x. 310 'i nunc et iuuenis specie' for 'nunc ergo specie iuuenis' ωX. Perhaps this variant points to a double recension. x. 354 'ut tamen et' for 'at tamen ut' ωX. xi. 85 'dabat' for 'daret' ωX. xii. 32 'incerte' (so P, incertae O) for 'incerto' ωX. xii. 46 'escaria' for 'escalia' ωX. Either reading is possible in the required sense. xiii. 132 'hoc casu' for 'occasu' ωX. xiv. 51 'quandoque' for 'quandoquidem' ωX. xiv. 52 'quoque—qui' for 'tibi—cum' ωX. xiv. 82 'hinc' for 'tunc' ωX. xiv. 147 'mittentur [mitentur P]' for 'mittuntur' ωX. xiv.

219 'exigua et' for 'exigua' ωX. xv. 25 'duxerat' for the unmetrical 'deduxerat' ωX *Bob.*

4. Passages where R agrees with φ in giving the right reading against Pω.

iii. 187 'libis' φ *Val.* X 2 for the erroneous 'libris' PBΣωX.

vi. 585

> diuitibus responsa feret[1] Phryx augur et Indus
> conductus, dabit astrorum mundique peritus,
> atque aliquis senior qui publica fulgura condit.

So R with φ. The passage is of known difficulty. Editors usually accept 'inde,' the reading of P *Val.* X and almost all MSS., understanding 'inde' as equivalent to 'a Phrygia' i.e. 'a Phrygian augur who has also been hired from thence': but to extract 'a Phrygia' out of Phryx is harsh. Others, as I did in my edition, accept Bücheler's rewriting of the word, 'Indae'; which is unsatisfactory as we know nothing of Indian female fortune-tellers. What seems to be wanted is an appellative adjective to balance 'Phryx'; this is found in 'Indus,' which is therefore probably right. Juvenal may well have heard reports about the lore of the Brahmins. The mention of such improbable remote diviners is in keeping with the satirist's love of rhetorical exaggeration. 'A Phrygian diviner (says Juvenal) and an Indian who has been retained will supply their prognostications to the rich, a professor in the lore of stars and sky will supply them, and some grey-beard as well who is the official purger of the lightning's curse.'

ix. 105. 'tollito' is the reading of R with GV *Val.* for 'tollite' PωX. I have already argued that 'tollito' should be accepted (*Classical Quarterly*, VI. 32).

x. 21

> et motae ad lunam trepidalis harundinis umbram.

[1] For 'feret' (so Oφ) PG have 'dabunt' P^2Vφ 'dabit.'

So R with GV for 'motae—umbras' ω. Here P has 'mota—umbram.' I now with Leo accept the reading 'motae—umbram,' which better accounts for P's reading 'mota—umbram' (since mota is a mere slip for motae) than does the reading of ϕ 'mota—umbra,' which I printed in my edition following Bücheler's suggestion.

5. At iii. 259 X agrees with P and its cognates against ω in giving what appears to be the wrong reading. Here 'quid superest e corporibus' is the reading of X along with PBGO, while 'de' is given for 'e' by $P^2\omega R$. In my edition I accepted 'e,' following Beer's suggestion (*Spicilegium Iuuenalianum*, p. 65), partly on account of the authority of P, and partly because 'e' in such expressions is as good Latin as 'de': Caes. *B. G.* i. 26 'ex eo proelio circiter milia hominum cxxx superfuerunt.' Ov. *Am.* III. 9. 59 'si tamen e nobis aliquid nisi nomen et umbra restat.' I am now convinced that 'de' is right, not on account of the empirical reason assigned by Bücheler that "Juvenal uses 'ex' generally, 'e' only in special phrases such as 'e caelo, e medio';" but because in this case 'de' represents the genitive case 'quid de corporibus' = 'quid corporum.' This use of 'de' to express the genitive case is characteristic of the Vulgar Latin, which here again appears in Juvenal's language. So i. 34 'de nobilitate (= nobilitatis) comesa quod superest.' i. 66 'multum referens de Maecenate (= multum Maecenatis).' iii. 123 'exiguum de naturae patriaeque ueneno' (= exiguum ueneni). x. 28 'de sapientibus (= sapientium) alter.' xv. 92 'aliquid de sanguine (= sanguinis).' In the later Latin this use became very common. "The genitive, little by little, was supplanted by other constructions, generally by the ablative with *de*" says Grandgent, *Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, § 88. Many examples are given by Grandgent and by M. D. Brock, *Studies in Fronto*, p. 199.

On the other hand X often coincides with ω against P in the wrong reading, as ii. 30 'reuocarat' for 'reuocabat' PBR. iii. 158 'iuuenemque' for 'iuuenesque' PBR. iii. 246 'lignum' for 'tignum' PBR.

6. Sometimes X coincides with ϕ in the wrong reading against Pω, as ii. 29 'tragico nuper' for 'nuper tragico' BBω. ii. 117 'quadraginta' for 'quadringenta' Pω.

Also at i. 106

'quid confert purpura maior
optandum?'

X has 'purpure amator'; there are still more strange variants 'purpuram actor' G, 'purpura maiorum' (with an impossible hypermetric syllable) V. The correct reading 'purpura maior' is found in PBωR. Here the reading of P^1 is wrongly reported by Leo as 'purpurae amator.' The MS. has purpurae $ma^{a}||or$. From examination[1] it is clear that the original hand had 'purpura maior.' This was altered by P^2 to 'purpurae $mator^{a}$.' Later, a further hand scratched out the 't' of 'amator' and inserted 'i' in the erasure; thus altering the reading back to that of the original hand, since the 'a' above the line was disregarded.

7. Peculiar readings in X are vii. 184 'quanticumque domum' for 'domus.' 'Quanticumque domum sc. emerit' is as good as 'quanticumque domus sc. constet.' The ellipsis of the accusative is like xiv. 135 'quo tibi diuitias?' Also over 'ministro' iii. 46 is written the singular variant 'magistro.' This is found in Ruperti's Ulmiensis, and 'domum' in his Gaybacensis.

8. Sometimes R coincides with ϕ against Pω in giving the wrong reading.

iii. 237

transitus arto
uicorum inflexu.

So all MSS. except R, which has 'in flexu,' and O which has 'flexu,' omitting 'in.' The reading 'in flexu' was adopted by Housman from the 'editiones ueteres.' But though it is true

[1] I give the readings of P from my own collation.

that the substantive 'flexus' is common, while 'inflexus' is rare (it is quoted, besides this passage, only from Sen. *Breu. Vit.* 12. 4 and Arnob. 2, p. 57 by Forcellini), this is clearly one of the cases in which the vocabulary of later Latin appears first or nearly first in Juvenal. The word is doubtless colloquial, as 'mero (for nudo) pede' (vi. 159), 'antrum' for a roomy litter (iv. 21), 'longe' for 'diu' (vi. 561, vii. 41), 'ueruex' for a blockhead (x. 50), 'assae' 'nurses' (xiv. 208) and 'inscripta' for 'stigmata' (xiv. 24) (so I explain this crux) are colloquialisms. In 'inflexu' I recognise the signature of Juvenal.

Again at vii. 184

> ueniet qui fercula docte
> componat, ueniet qui pulmentaria condit,

for 'condit' the reading of PωX 'condat' is found in RX^{2}VOϕ. The change from the subjunctive to the indicative mood has occasioned this bad grammatical interpolation, bad because 'condat' does not give the meaning: for this 'condiat' is required, which has actually been proposed as an emendation by Lachmann, though Juvenal does not employ synizesis. In order to regularise the moods Leo follows Housman in retaining 'condit' and accepting 'componit' from G. 'Artifices dicit, inde indicatiui' says Leo. But we have here an instance of variation of construction, the consecutive subjunctive 'componat' being followed by a relative indicative clause, the same variation as is found in xv. 169 'aspicimus populos quorum non *sufficit* irae | occidisse aliquem, sed pectora bracchia uoltum *crediderint* genus esse cibi.' The meaning is 'A man to superintend skilfully the dishes will be found and one who flavours entrées will be found.' There will be a *structor* and a *cocus*. 'Qui condit' = cocus: cp. ix. 145 'sit mihi praeterea curuus caelator, et alter | qui multas facies pingit cito.' The variation of mood is Plautine and, I suspect, colloquial: *Rud.* 128

> hic dico, in fanum Veneris mulierculas
> duas secum *adduxit*, quique *adornaret* sibi
> ut rem diuinam faciat.

These are some of the more important passages in which the two MSS. disagree: I pass to the far larger class in which they coincide in the same reading.

9. Sometimes they agree with P and its cognates in giving the right reading against ω, or the majority of that class, as in i. 68 'fecerit' for 'fecerat.' viii. 33 'prauam' for 'paruam.' Sometimes they agree with Pω in giving the right reading against a few other MSS. (ϕ). The following is an interesting example. At i. 168 they have correctly with PBω

inde irae et lacrimae.

Here for 'irae' GO *Val.* and a few other MSS. have 'ira,' a reading which is adopted by no editor except Housman, who defends it because "the singular *ira*, not the plural *irae*, is the just and proper counterpart to the plural *lacrimae*, which is of another nature." This justification fails because it does not take account of Latin usage. The Latin plural very early underwent a weakening, so that it ceased to differ from the singular in meaning, and as time went on this weakening tendency increased, and, like other forms of confusion, confusion of number came to be characteristic of the Vulgar Latin (Brock, *Studies in Fronto*, p. 192, Schmalz, *Latein. Grammatik*, p. 432). This is why the plural is often used in the singular sense; thus in Juvenal we find tempora 'the age' (ii. 38), delubra 'a temple' (iii. 13), saecula 'a reign' (iv. 68), solacia 'consolation' (xiii. 179), dolia 'a vat' (xiv. 308), bona summa = bonum summum (v. 2), operas (= operam) dedit (vi. 383). With the word 'ira' this is conspicuously the case; singular and plural are used indifferently with identical sense. Thus Catullus 64. 194 'frons expirantis praeportat pectoris iras.' Lucret. v. 1195 'talia diuis cum tribuit facta atque iras adiunxit acerbas.' Vergil, *G.* iv. 453 'non te nullius exercent numinis irae.' *Aen.* ix. 65 'Rutulo ignescunt irae.' Livy VI. 18. 3 'plenior animorum irarumque.' It is clear that not 'ira' but 'irae' is the correct reading, and the reading which Cyprian had before him, as appears from his imitation *Heptat. Genes.* 895 'inde irae et lacrimae et fraus quaesita nocendi.'

10. In many passages RX agree with ω against P in giving the right reading, as ii. 150 'contum' against 'pontum' PΣV *Arov.* iii. 182 'ambitiosa' against 'ambitiosi' PB. iii. 227 'diffunditur' against 'defunditur' PBΣV. iv. 15 'nullum' against 'multum' PB. iv. 33 'fracta' against 'facta' PB. v. 39 'phialas' against 'phiala' PB. x. 114 'ac famam' against 'aut' P. *Sang.* xiii. 65 'miranti' against 'mirandis' P. In i. 148 RXω have

eadem cupient facientque minores.

Editors follow PBϕ in reading 'facient cupientque'; but 'cupient facientque' is preferable and should be restored. Desire precedes action. 'They will desire and carry their desires into effect.' Sen. *epp.* 116. 1 'cum tibi cupere interdixero, uelle permittam, ut eadem illa intrepide facias.' In ii. 34 RXP$^2\omega$ have

nonne igitur iure ac merito uitia ultima fictos
contemnunt Scauros et castigata remordent?

B and obviously P, which is erased, have 'omnia' for 'ultima.' But 'ultima' is more effective. It is said in reference to the illustration given above, the profligate Varillus retorting on the depraved noble Sextus (ll. 21—22). The meaning is not that all vicious persons but that even the most vicious may justly retort on sham moralists and bite the hand that strikes.

In ii. 168

nam si mora longior urbem
indulsit pueris, non umquam derit amator.
mittentur bracae cultelli frena flagellum,

Rω have 'non umquam,' X has 'ñumquam,' PV have 'non numquam.' In this difficult passage I now think that 'non umquam' is right. The evidence of X is important; its contracted reading 'ñumquam' (= non umquam) explains how the reading 'non numquam' came to be. The meaning is 'If the boys are granted a prolonged sojourn in Rome, they will never fail to find an admirer. They will receive presents of clothing, knives, bridles, and a whip.' 'Mittentur' is used in the sense of sending presents, as in iii. 45 'quae mittit adulter.' iv. 20 'magnae si misit amicae.'

In v. 115

flaui dignus ferro Meleagri
fumat aper

RXω have 'fumat,' while PBΣ have 'spumat.' Editors usually accept 'spumat,' understanding either that the foam on the boar's mouth was represented by cream in the cookery, or that foam is mentioned as a standing attribute of the Calydonian boar. Either explanation is artificial. I now think that the natural word 'fumat' is correct. Possibly 'spumat' is an interpolation due to Martial XIV. 221. 2 'spumeus in longa cuspide fumet aper.' Martial says correctly that a foaming (ferocious) boar is roasted on a spit; but to say that a foaming boar is served at table is a strange expression.

In vi. 159

obseruant ubi festa mero pede sabbata reges
nudo

Xω have 'mero,' R has mero, while PBO have 'nudo.' In the expression 'the land where kings observe the sabbath with bare foot' the custom of taking off the shoes on entering the Jewish Temple is probably alluded to. 'Mero pede' like 'calce mera' (Prudent. *Peristeph.* 6. 91) belongs to the Vulgar Latin. Friedländer compares 'mero meridie' 'at full midday' Petron. 37. The unmetrical 'nudo' has long been considered a gloss that has crept into the text in place of 'mero.' This obvious hypothesis is now substantiated by the reading of R, which shows the error in the making, just as 'mero' written above 'nudo' by the second hand in P shows it.

In viii. 93

quam fulmine iusto
et Capito et Numitor ruerint damnante senatu

R *Val.* ω have 'Tutor,' X has Tuto||, for which Pϕ have 'Numitor,' which reading most editors accept. Though we know that Capito Cossutianus was convicted of *repetundae* for misgovernment of Cilicia, A.D. 57, we know of no Numitor in such connexion. Hosius (*App. crit. ad Iuv.* p. 93) proposed to restore 'Tutor' to the text, and suggested that 'Numitor'

may be an error due to reminiscence of Verg. *Aen.* vi. 768 'et Capys et Numitor.' I am convinced that this is correct. Tutor is the person in question. A certain C. Velleius Tutor was consul A.D. 27 and a Velleius Tutor A.D. 46.

In xii. 73

sublimis apex, cui candida nomen
scrofa dedit, laetis Phrygibus mirabile sumen

RXω have 'mirabile,' P has 'miserabile.' If 'miserabile' be kept, with most editors, the meaning must be the same as in line 67 'inopi miserabilis arte cucurrit,' viz. 'the udder that moved the pity of the joyful Phrygians.' But it is more probable that it is an error due to the 'miserabilis' preceding in l. 67, what Havet calls 'suggestion d'un mot antérieur' (*Manuel de Critique Verbale*, § 496). I now think that 'mirabile' should be restored, as reproducing Verg. *Aen.* viii. 81 'subitum atque oculis mirabile monstrum.'

In xiii. 49

nondum aliquis sortitus triste profundi
imperium, aut Sicula toruos cum coniuge Pluton

RXω have 'aliquis' which is omitted in P. Also 'aut' is omitted in O and in X. Building on these omissions Mr Housman reads

nondum <imi> sortitus triste profundi
imperium Sicula toruos cum coniuge Pluton

comparing Ovid *Met.* iv. 444 'imi tecta tyranni.' 'Grim Pluto and his Sicilian wife had not yet received the dismal sovereignty of nethermost hell.' This is ingenious. But it may be urged that no conjecture can be built on the omission of 'aliquis' in P, which is an obvious slip. Such errors of omission are frequent in P, which omits for instance 'timor' (i. 85), 'est' (iii. 197), 'nisi' (vi. 518), 'autem' (vii. 217), 'nullum' (ix. 82), 'i' (x. 166), 'ille' (x. 197), 'tota' (xi. 141), 'a' (xii. 14), 'nolens' (xii. 38), 'per Histrum' (xii. 111), 'amnis' (xiii. 69), 'et' (xiii. 190). Further there are two insuperable objections to the conjecture, (1) it leaves Neptune unmentioned in this full catalogue of the gods, (2) it assigns to 'profundum' the

meaning of 'hell,' a meaning which as far as I know is unparalleled. 'Profundum' generally means 'the deep,' the sea, as Val. Flacc. ii. 606 'pater ipse profundi' (Neptune). It may mean 'the sky' as in Manilius, v. 721 (of the stars)

resplendent uasto caeli summota profundo.

The same word could hardly mean both heaven and hell in so precise a language as Latin. Considering the quantity of theological literature that has been written in this language, if this were so, it would lead to confusing results. 'Aliquis' is unquestionably right. 'A certain personage had not as yet received the dismal sovreignty of the deep (i.e. Neptune), there was as yet no grim Pluto with his Sicilian wife.' The colloquial use of 'aliquis' is in harmony with the irony of the passage: cp. Petron. 105 'Capillos aliquis in naue praecidit.' There is the same colloquial irony in the use of 'alius' to describe Jason i. 10 'unde alius furtiuae deuehat aurum pelliculae,' and in the description of Laertes x. 257 'atque alius, cui fas Ithacum lugere natantem.'

In v. 41 RX agree with ϕ against Pω in giving the wrong reading 'amicos' for 'acutos' PBω.

11. I now come to the largest class of passages, that in which RX agree with ω against P and its cognates in giving the wrong reading. As the proof that these two MSS. belong generally to the ω class depends on this, I will first give a list of such readings, and then deal with certain passages in greater detail.

RX have i. 2 codri, 44 Lugdunensem, 47 at, 52 herculeias, 67 falso, 86 est farrago libelli, 110 nec, 114 habitas, 134 caules, 143 crudum, ii. 5 horum est, ii. 92 cocyton, 106 bebriaci campo, 116 abscidere, 140 morientur, iii. 18 praestantius, 19 aquae, 37 quemlibet, 67 rechedipna, 79 ad summam, 105 alienum uultum, 112 aulam, 131 serui, 156 in fornice, 168 negauit, 188 praestant, 210 aerumnae (*om.* est), 212 asturi, 215 occurrit, 288 praemia, 321 conuelle, iv. 3 aeger—fortis, 18 si] in, 25 pretium squamae, 31 ructaret, 34 licet hic, 43 torpentis, 67 saginis, 147 getis, v. 38 berillos, 42 illic, 63 uocatus, 70 factus, 72 artocopi

(artokopi X), 121 spectas, vi. 152 et, 158 hunc (R omits the word), 316 ululante priapo, 395 ut uideo, 404 decipiatur, 486 profectura domo (unmetrical), 490 componit, vii. 99 petit, 120 afrorum, 123 in foedere, 236 siculus, ix. 26 quod taceo atque, 68 seruorum mense, x. 116 partam, 211 citharoedus situe seleucus, 295 suam, xi. 128 bilis, 195 praedo, xii. 59 taeda, 81 tunc stagnante sinu, 113 sacra, xiii. 4 fallacis urnam, 57 farra, 123 suscipit, 142 uilis populus, 189 docens, 212 et, xiv. 16 animos, 38 damnis huiusce etenim uel, 115 atque uerendi, 121 putant, 121—122 illam—uiam, 131 concam aestiui, 158 post haec, 176 indomiti, 199 trepido, 217 longi, 247 caucam, 289 uda, xv. 20 cyanes, 27 iunio, 35 combos, 44 interea, 46 ripa (rippa R), 65 quali se, 93 ut—usi, 104 uiribus, xvi. 4 pluris enim, 12 oculos—relictos, 23 mutinensi, 29 quem.

In i. 122 RXω have 'praegnans.' The genuine form no doubt is that preserved by PB 'praegnas.' So 'praegnatem' P in vi. 405. 'Praegnas' is the Vulgar Latin form (Grandgent, § 311), here employed by Juvenal, as he employs the Vulgar forms 'cludo' (iii. 19, iv. 21, vi. 68 etc. Grandgent, § 211, Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 40) and 'adamans' (vi. 156), by which archaic and vulgar spelling the length of the final syllable is indicated. So the ablative 'Calpŏ' (xiv. 279), coming not from the usual nominative Calpō, but from a late Greek nom. Calpis, indicates influence of *κοινὴ λέξις*.

In i. 126

'profer, Galla, caput.' 'noli uexare, quiescet'

RXω have 'quiescit.' The undoubtedly right reading 'quiescet' is found in B, which has been altered by the second hand into 'quiescit,' as Mr C. E. Stuart informs me on the authority of M. Nougaret, who has examined the manuscript afresh. 'Quiescet' also is indicated by the reading of P, which has 'quiescaet.' The diphthong indicates a conflation of two readings; what the scribe of P had before him in his original was quiesc^{at}et. It is hard to say whether -at was intended as an interlinear gloss or a variant: 'quiescat' seems to be read in no MS. Similarly in Persius ii. 22 the manuscript A has

'clamaet,' which is a conflation of two known readings 'clamat' and 'clamet.'

Reading 'quiescet' the passage should be stopped as above: the words 'noli uexare, quiescet' are spoken not by the designing husband but by the patron: the future indicates a command to the praeco, as the future is used imperatively viii. 38, x. 347. 'Don't trouble her (he says), let her sleep.' We are thus informed of the success of the husband's trick, of which, if 'quiescit' be read and if the whole clause is assigned to the husband, we are left to guess the result. (Radermacher, *Rhein. Mus.* LX. 245.)

In i. 150

dices hic forsitan 'unde
ingenium par materiae?'

for dices PBO we find 'dicas' in RXω. I see no reason why 'dicas' should be preferred to 'dices,' as it is by Mr Housman followed by Leo. Two reasons are given for preferring it: "(1) because *forsitan* in Juvenal regularly takes the subjunctive, and (2) because, apart from *forsitan*, the subjunctive is usual when no definite person is addressed" (Housman, *pref.* p. xix).

As to (1), though *forsitan* (*forsan*) is not common (occurring only eight times) in Juvenal, it appears that, leaving aside the present passage, out of the other seven the indicative, not the subjunctive, is used in two passages, and is found so in Mr Housman's own text: xii. 125 'omnia soli *forsan* Pacuuio breuiter *dabit*.' xiv. 295 'hac *forsitan* ipsa nocte *cadet*.'

As to (2), the passages where the subjunctive undoubtedly occurs are v. 156 '*forsitan* inpensae Virronem parcere *credas*,' viii. 113 '*forsitan* inbellis Rhodios—*despicias*,' xi. 162 '*forsitan expectes*,' xiv. 34 '*forsitan* haec *spernant* iuuenes,' and with *forsan* vi. 14 'uestigia *forsan* aut aliqua *extiterint*.' Of these v. 156, viii. 113, xi. 162 are not cases of subjunctive "where no definite person is addressed," but in each the person definitely addressed in the satire is the person addressed, in v. Trebius, in viii. Ponticus, in xi. Persicus. The other two, xiv. 34 and vi. 14, do not count, as there is a definite subject

in each case, *iuuenes*, *uestigia*. Moreover the statement that "the subjunctive is usual when no definite person is addressed" is in direct conflict with the conclusion at which Dr Roby arrives in his exhaustive essay on this particular point (*Latin Grammar*, II. Preface, pp. ci—cvii), where after a long collection of instances Dr Roby decides that "the indicative is the ordinary use" (p. ciii). The truth is that either mood is possible; 'dicet'='he will say,' 'dicat'='he might say.' Either mood might be used, according to what was intended.

In i. 156

qua stantes ardent qui fixo pectore fumant

the reading 'pectore' is due to PBO, 'gutture' is found in RXω. The reading 'gutture' is absurd. It is defended by Mr Housman on the ground that to fasten a victim by the throat would involve less trouble. As if the object of torturers was to save themselves trouble! Such people are prepared to take infinite trouble. And consider what the result of fastening the victim by the throat would be. The swift result would be throttling and consequent death, the last thing desired by the torturer, whose object is to prolong the pain. This would be better attained by fastening by the chest: then the victim while being roasted could not struggle, so far from stopping his anguish by throttling himself he could not even show it. So the scholiast understood it: 'ut lucerent spectatoribus, cum fixa essent illis guttura, ne se curuarent.'

In i. 161

accusator erit qui uerbum dixerit 'hic est'

RXω have 'uerum.' The true reading 'uerbum' is due to P which has uer*vm*, the *vm* by the 3rd hand in an erasure. In the margin by a late hand, the 4th hand, is written 'uel uerbum,' which is a restoration of the original reading, since it is clear that *bum* occupied the erasure. The construction is 'accusator erit (ei) qui.' 'There will be a prosecutor for the man who utters the expression "That is he."' For 'uerbum' 'an expression, a few words,' cp. Plaut. *Aul.* 547 'illud mihi uerbum non placet "quod nunc habes."'

In ii. 45

'faciunt qui plura'

RXω have 'hi,' O 'nam.' The word is erased in P. The reading 'qui' found in B is doubtless right.

In iii. 78

in caelum miseris, ibit

RXω as well as BP^2 have 'iusseris,' which most editors accept. The reading 'miseris' is due to *Arov.* The reading of P '/// seris' indicates the same; the erased word must have been something different from 'iusseris' the reading of P^2. I therefore think 'miseris' right. Cp. viii. 171 'mitte Ostia, Caesar, mitte.' Stat. *Theb.* x. 665 'astra uocant, caeloque animum, plus concipe, mittes.'

In iii. 215 foll.

ardet adhuc, et iam accurrit qui marmora donet,
conferat inpensas; hic nuda et candida signa,
hic aliquid praeclarum Euphranoris et Polycliti,
haec Asianorum uetera ornamenta deorum,
hic libros dabit et forulos mediamque Mineruam,
hic modium argenti,

in l. 218 'haec Asianorum' is found in PBΣ, for which RX *Val.* ω have 'fecasianorum,' and O has 'hic Asianorum,' which I adopted in my first, but abandoned in my second edition.

The reading 'fecasianorum' is a 'uox nihili.' It was interpreted by scholiasts as the name of a people, as by the scholiast of X quoted at the beginning of this article. It has occasioned the ingenious conjecture of Roth 'phaecasiatorum' 'wearing *phaecasia*,' the *phaecasium* being the ritualistic white shoe worn by priests (*ὑπόδημα λευκὸν Ἀττικὸν, ὃ καὶ Ἀθηναίων ἔχουσιν ἱερεῖς καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων, καὶ καλοῦσι φαικάσιον*, App. *B. C.* v. 11. See *Classical Review*, XI. 402). But it was the priest not the gods who wore these shoes. The gods' statues were probably shoeless.

The reading 'haec Asianorum' is unquestionably right. It has troubled commentators because of the intrusion, by the feminine *haec* among so many *hics*, of a solitary female among

so many males. Absurd solutions have been proposed, such as that no scene is complete without the presence of a lady. The correct interpretation of the passage depends on the meaning of *ornamenta*, which is no vague word importing no specific kind of artistic work ('decorations'), but means specifically 'jewels,' a sense the word often has. Thus in Plaut. *Pseud.* 343 Ballio says he has sold a girl 'sine ornamentis, cum intestinis omnibus,' without her jewels, as she was furnished by nature. So *Mostell.* 248 'cedo mi speculum et cum ornamentis arculam actutum.' 'Give me my mirror and jewel-case with the jewels.' *Stich.* 172 'uenalis ego sum cum ornamentis omnibus.' (Cic. II. *in Verr.* iv. 126 is different. There 'ornamenta fanorum' = statues.) This gives the key to the introduction of the lady. It is appropriate that jewels should be contributed by a lady, jewels that had once belonged to shrines in Ionia. The millionaire Asturicus' house has been destroyed by fire. His friends hasten to contribute the requisites for rebuilding and refitting it. Then are mentioned in regular order (1) slabs of marble (*marmora*) and other materials for building, bricks, wood, etc., *impensas* (cp. Ammian. Marc. XXIX. 6. 11 'impensas aedificandi causa theatri dudum congestas'); (2) marble statues (*candida signa*) and bronzes 'some masterpiece of Euphranor and Polyclitus,' these two artists were both the authors of masterpieces in bronze (Mitchell, *History of Ancient Sculpture*, p. 482, 384); (3) jewels (*ornamenta*); (4) requisites to stock the library, books (*libros*), a bookcase (*forulos*) and a bust of Minerva, the patron of letters; (5) cash (*argenti*), so abundant that it is measured out in bushels.

In iii. 240

curret super ora Liburna

'Liburna' is preserved by PBΣV, while RXω have 'Liburno.' The noble is carried in a litter of the Liburnian type, not on the shoulders of Liburnian bearers, as the scholiast rightly notes 'lectica magna Liburnata, nec gerulus Liburnus.' If bearers were meant, the plural 'Liburnis' would be necessary. A litter cannot be carried by one bearer. Hence 'Liburna' is right.

In iii. 321

saturarum ego, ni pudet illas,
auditor gelidos ueniam caligatus in agros

'auditor' is preserved in PB, while RXω have 'adiutor.' The passage is a well-known crux. Those who accept 'adiutor' understand it in the military sense of 'a second in command,' and explain 'caligatus' as meaning the soldier's hobnailed boots. Umbricius is to come as his military adjutant to assist Juvenal the general in his campaign of satire. But 'caligae' did not mean only military boots. In the Vulgar Latin it meant hobnailed boots for country wear. 'Tanto melior, Massa, dono tibi caligas,' 'Bravo, Massa, I'll give you a pair of boots' says Habinnas to his slave in Petron. 69. So Tertull. *Pudic.* 18 'nisi posteaquam caligas fratrum deterserit.' In *Edict. Dioclet.* 9. 5 'caligae' are defined as 'mulionicae siue rusticae.' Here again we have in Juvenal a trace of Vulgar Latin. Umbricius will come in his country boots to form the audience when Juvenal recites. It will be no fashionably attended recitation, like those in Rome, but will be done in simple country style.

In v. 80

aspice quam longo distinguat pectore lancem
quae fertur domino squilla

'distinguat' is due to PB, while RXω have 'distendat.' 'Distendat' is supposed to mean 'fills to the full.' But a soft lobster could not stretch a hard dish. Thus 'distinguat' is clearly right. It means 'separates from the rest, makes conspicuous.'

In v. 116

post hunc tradentur tubera

'tradentur' is due to PB, and is clearly right. Truffles will next be served. Here XP$^2\phi$ have 'radentur,' Rϕ 'raduntur.' But they would not be peeling the truffles at table; this would be done in the kitchen.

In v. 141

sed tua nunc Mygale pariat licet et pueros tres
in gremium patris fundat semel.

Here 'Mygale' is due to PΣ, similarly 'Migale' B. RXω have 'Mycale' (Micale R). For 'semel' PB 'simul' is found in RXω.

Editors accept 'Mycale' as the name of the humble consort of Trebius. Mycale is the name of the mother of Orios, one of the Lapithae, in Ov. *Met.* xii. 263, and of a promontory near Samos in *Met.* ii. 223. I think that here 'Mygale,' preserved by P, is the right form. Mygale = *μυγαλῆ* 'field-mouse.' The lady is called by the pet name of an animal, like *Μοσχίων* 'the calf' in Menander's *περικειρομένη*. Females were sometimes called by names denoting things, as *Μυρρίνη* 'Miss Myrtle' (Ar. *Lysistr.*, Ter. *Hec.*), *Ἀβροτόνον* 'Southernwood' (Menander, *Ἐπιτρεπ.*). So *Βούκιννα* 'she who blows the trumpet' (Schuze, *Lat. Eigennam.* p. 596), cp. *βουκινίζω* and *Βουκοπία* 'Cattle-girl' (Schulze, p. 332). It may be objected that the first syllable of Mygale is long. The answer is that we have here a weakening of quantity due to the fact that the stress is on the last syllable of the word. This again reveals the influence of the Vulgar Latin, where the quantity tended to conform to the stress; which explains such shortenings as 'equitesque Bĭthyni' (vii. 15), 'ficĕdulas' (xvi. 9), a phaenomenon to which I have lately drawn attention (*Classical Quarterly*, VIII. 27 foll.).

As to 'semel,' which has caused some difficulty to editors, it means 'on one occasion,' like Hor. *Sat.* II. 8. 27 'totas semel' absorbere placentas' = 'at one mouthful' "tout entières d'une seule bouchée" Lejay, who quotes several instances; and like Mart. VIII. 52. 4 'tonsor aequandas semel (on one occasion) ad genas rogatus.' 'Simul' would suit a triplet born by simultaneous birth; but the same meaning is got by 'semel.'

In vi. 248

quem cauat adsiduis rudibus scutoque lacessit

'rudibus' is the reading of PB, which I restored to the text. RX with P$^2\omega$ have 'sudibus.' 'Rudes,' wooden foils with which fencers practised, is clearly the appropriate word. 'Sudes' were stakes carried by soldiers, which in battle were sometimes used as rough weapons (Sall. *Cat.* 56. 3, Sil. Ital. viii. 552),

[1] Here some MSS. read 'simul.'

but were not used in fencing. Livy XL. 6. 6 speaks of 'uulnera rudibus facta' because he is there describing a 'ludicrum certamen.'

In vi. 497

> est in consilio materna admotaque lanis
> emerita quae cessat acu

'materna' is due to PTϕ, and *Val.* which has matna^{ro} (i.e. 'materna' altered to 'matrona'). RX with most MSS. have 'matrona.' The adornment of the lady's hair is considered by a bedchamber council of maids, the chief of which is an old *ancilla,* who had served the lady's mother, whose business now is spinning (*lanis*); though formerly she was the *ornatrix* she is now unemployed with the hairpin (*acu*). There is no point in introducing a *matrona* into the scene.

In vii. 59 sqq.

> neque enim cantare sub antro
> Pierio thyrsumque potest contingere maesta
> paupertas

'maesta' is found in Pϕ, while RXω have 'sana,' Oϕ 'saeua.' 'Maesta paupertas' is what is required: 'doleful poverty' has no sympathy with the merry thyrsus. The two things are contrasted in a forcible antithesis. The reading 'saeua' is interpolated from Hor. *Carm.* I. 12. 43 'saeua paupertas et auitus apto cum lare fundus.' The reading 'sana' is an extraordinary interpolation, which is explained by the scholium in X quoted above as meaning that poverty compels men to be sane, whereas poetry is a species of insanity; which note is a warning against over-refining in comment.

In vii. 146

> quando licet Basilo flentem producere matrem

'producere' is due to P *Arov.* GV *Val.*, while RXω have 'deducere.' 'Producere' to produce in court is the right word, not 'deducere' to escort.

In vii. 156

> quae ueniant diuersae forte sagittae

'diuersae forte' is in P *Arov.*, while Xϕ have 'diuersa e parte,' Rω 'diuersa parte.' Each reading makes sense, but 'diuersae forte' is superior, because 'forte' implies that it is not known but can only be conjectured by the clever advocate what arguments will be used by the other side.

In vii. 159

laeuae parte mamillae
nil salit Arcadico iuueni

'laeuae (leue)' is due to P *Arov.*, while Xω have 'laeua in,' RGV 'laeua.' Here the ablative 'laeua' is impossible. It is supposed to mean 'in the left side of his chest,' i.e. in the heart, the seat of the intellect. But *mamilla* 'a single breast' cannot mean the same as *pectus* 'the chest.' The required sense is given by 'laeuae'; in a part of his left breast means under his left breast, in his heart. Cp. Pers. iii. 111 'cor tibi rite salit?'

In viii. 38

et metues ne tu sic Creticus aut Camerinus

'sic (sc. sis)' is the conjecture of Junius, usually accepted. Here RXω have 'metues ne tu sis'; but P has 'metues ne tus si^{s}' the 's' after 'tu' has been erased, the 's' after 'si' is written above the line by P^{2}. I think the true reading is

metues ne sic sis Creticus.

The erased 's' after 'tu' in P conceals 'sic'; while 'tu' was a gloss written above 'sic,' which got into the text. That such a gloss could thus get into the text is shown by the reading of X at viii. 75 which for 'noluerim sic ut nihil ipse futurae' has 'noluerim sic ut tu nihil ipse futurae.' My reading is preferable to that of Junius grammatically, because though the substantive verb is often omitted when indicative, as i. 144 'hinc subitae mortes (fiunt),' its omission is generally avoided when subjunctive.

In viii. 155 'robumque iuuencum' is the reading of Σ *Sang.*, and of P, in which it has been erased and altered to 'toruumque' which is found in RXω. In describing a sacrifice the archaic ritual word 'robus' is clearly more appropriate than the point-

less 'toruus.' Festus 264 'robum rubro colore.' In viii. 239, speaking of Cicero's precautions against Catiline, Juvenal says 'in omni monte laborat.' So PGΣ, while RXω have 'gente' for 'monte.' To say that Cicero was active on all the hills of Rome is correct, to say that he was active in all the races of Italy is an exaggeration.

In x. 116

quisquis adhuc uno parcam colit asse Mineruam

'parcam' is due to P, while RXω have 'partam.' 'Parcam' is a case of transferred epithet. The boy as yet (*adhuc*) can pay only thrifty worship to Minerva by the offering of a single *as* as his *stips*. Cp. Stat. *Theb.* xii. 487 'parca superstitio: non turea flamma, nec altus accipitur sanguis.' This passage has been much misunderstood. It was certainly misunderstood by the author of the reading 'partam.'

In x. 312

poenas metuit quascumque mariti
irati debet

which is the way in which the passage stands in P, most MSS. and X have 'exigere irati debent' in defiance of metre, R has 'exigere irati,' omitting 'debent.' Clearly 'exigere' is a gloss which crept into the text. The scribes found before them

exigere
irati debent.

The passage has been variously treated. I believe the reading of P is sound, and means 'He is doomed to pay all the penalties exacted by the angry husband of which he stands in dread.' 'Mariti irati' is genitive of author.

In xiii. 28

nunc aetas agitur peioraque tempora ferri
temporibus

'nunc' is due to P, while RXω have 'nona.' Many editors adopt 'nona'; but are at variance as to what this 'ninth age' was; some take it as the ninth century of the city (A.D. 127 = V.C. 880), but the centuries of the city were not termed *aetates*;

others refer to the Etruscan doctrine of recurring cycles, the ninth of which was the worst (Verg. *Ec.* iv. 4): but this is far fetched. Hesiod's five ages (*Op.* 109), Ovid's four (*Met.* i. 89), and Aratus' three (*Phaen.* 100) naturally occur, but have not proved helpful. I find it hard to believe that so precise a writer as Juvenal could suddenly announce 'we are living in the ninth age,' without explaining from what point of view it is the ninth. If we adopt the reading of P, our best authority, 'nunc,' all is simple. 'We are now living (says Juvenal) in an epoch and an age that is worse than the (poet's) age of iron.'

I reserve to the end a few passages which seem to indicate a double recension by the poet, such as Leo has suggested.

In vii. 139 the line begins thus in P *Arov.* G *Val.* X^2

fidimus eloquio,

thus in RXω

ut redeant ueteres.

Either beginning is equally effective. 'Fidimus eloquio' is attested by Priscian iii. 329. On the other hand 'Vt redeant ueteres' recalls Martial XI. 5. 5 'si redeant ueteres, ingentia nomina, patres.' The correspondence in thought and expression between Juvenal and Martial has been discussed by Nettleship (*Essays*, II. 124 foll.). It looks as if Juvenal had here caught an expression of Martial and introduced it into his work, though whether into the earlier or the later edition cannot be said.

In vii. 144 the man's name is Gallus in P *Arov.* GV, while in RXω it is Cossus: similarly in viii. 147, 151, 167 the name is Lateranus in PΣGV, while in RXω it is Damasippus. One name does as well as the other: the poet may have had some reason unknown to us for altering the name in his second edition.

In viii. 7 the line 'Coruinum posthac' etc. found in P$\Sigma\phi$ is omitted in RXω. There is confusion in the text here, and signs of double recension, as Leo has pointed out.

In x. 72—73

sed quid
turba Remi.

so the text stands in PG *Val.*, we find a weaker version of the same expression in RXω, which have 'turba tremens.' Either would do: it looks as if the poet improved the vigour of his expression in his second edition.

It is obvious that, though the two Phillipps MSS. adhere in the main to the inferior tradition, they present many readings of great interest; and that from a careful study of them some advance may be made towards elucidating the serious difficulties which the text of Juvenal still presents.

S. G. OWEN.

Arg. 645 *ὕλῃ ἔνι πλαγχθείς, ἐν δὲ σπέος ἤλυθε νυμφῶν.*

Outside lyrical poetry *ἐν* cannot govern an accusative, nor can we get over the difficulty by professing that *ἐν* goes with *ἤλυθε*, for *ἐνήλυθε* could not govern an accusative either, even if there were such a verb. So many distinguished scholars have passed over the words without remark that I almost fear some blindness on my own part; do they take *ἐν δὲ* to mean "and withal," and *σπέος* as an "Attic" accusative? But that use of *ἐν δὲ* would not here be appropriate. Surely we should read *ἐπί*? The corruption would be due to the preceding *ἔνι*. *ἂν* were perhaps a slighter change, but less good.

The nymphs are then described by the MSS. as *Λιμνακίδων*. Ruhnken proposed for this *λειμακίδων*, which is accepted by Schneider and Hermann. Abel prefers *λιμναίων*, a suggestion thrown out by Hermann, because in the ordinary story the nymphs of Hylas were water-nymphs. But *σπέος* does not suit this, and therefore Ruhnken's reading had better be kept. "Orpheus" differs from the ordinary version of the stories he tells on many occasions, perhaps to shew some independence. Again, he says that the nymphs *κατερύκακον* Hylas, hardly a likely verb to use if they dragged him under water, and that their object was that he might be *ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήραος ἤματα πάντα*, which can hardly be attained by drowning your beloved out of hand.

Arg. 680 *αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα Φινῆος Ἀγηνορίδαο λιπόντες*
αὖλιν, ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης ἐξικόμεσθα.

Stephanus emended *ἔπειτα* to *ἐπεί*, which has also since been found in one MS., and argued that *ἐπεὶ* was used for *ἔπειτα*: Gesner maintained the same view, but perhaps no one

will now defend it. Hermann boldly reads *αὐτάρ οἱ*, because *οἱ* is used by this poet as a mere meaningless particle, but this is very licentious, nor does the fact that he elsewhere makes similar changes prove that he is right in any one of them. Nor can anything be said for Schneider's *ἐπὶ = ἐπὶ τούτοις*. Abel writes: *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Φινῆος Ἀγηνορίδεω κατέλειπον*, not observing apparently that, whether *κατέλειπον* be first person singular or third plural, it is in either case in flagrant discord with *ἐξικόμεσθα*. It seems to me more likely that the seat of corruption is in the word *Φινῆος*, which is plainly superfluous; either it may have come in as a gloss, displacing the original, or it may be that we should read *αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἐπὶ νηὸς Ἀγηνορίδαο λιπόντες*. Cf. 626: *ἡμεῖς δ' αὖτ' ἐπὶ νηὶ γεράσμια πέμπομεν ἱρά, βωμὸν ἐπιστέψαντες ἐπ' ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι, Πεισματίῃ τόθι πείσματ' ἐεργομένης λύθεν Ἀργοῦς*, which, I think, means: "and we on board ship offered sacrifices, after setting up on shore an altar to mark the spot, to Rhea Pismatia because there the cables of Argo were at last loosed from their impediment."

Arg. 745 *νέρθε δέ τοι Ἑλίκης δολιχὸς παρακέκλιται αὐχήν,*
ἔνθα δ' ὑπωρείῃσιν ἐπὶ προβλῆσι κυκλοῦνται
τηλεφανεῖς αὐλῶνες ὑπὲρ μυχὸν εὐρέα πόντου·
†οὗ Σύμης ὄρος αἰπὺ πολύς τ' εὐθαλέα λειμών†·
ἔνθα δ' Ἀράξεω ῥεῦμα μεγαβρεμέτου ποταμοῖο,
750 *ἐξ οὗ Θερμώδων Φᾶσις Τάναΐς τε ῥέουσιν·*
οὗ Κόλχων κλυτὰ φῦλα καὶ Ἡνιόχων καὶ Ἀβάσγων·
ὃν παραμειβόμενοι μυχάτοις ἐπεπλείομεν ὅρμοις....

749 Ἀράξεω Hermann, Ἀράξου. 751 Ἀβάσγων Hermann, Ἀραξῶν.

Gesner protested that he was not more astonished at three rivers flowing out of the Araxes than at the Danube in Herodotus running through all Europe. I myself once rashly proposed to read *εἰς ὃν* for *ἐξ οὗ* (*Journ. Phil.* No. 51, p. 76). But we only need a transposition of 750 to follow 745, or possibly 747, and everything is saved so far as the source of these rivers is concerned. "Next comes the long range of Helice, whence flow Thermodon etc." Helice is the range

which Apollonius calls the Amazonian (ii 977), from which Thermodon springs to enter the Euxine. It might well enough be extended to cover the source of Phasis also, as here. But what is Tanais doing in this neighbourhood? This poet is tolerably strong on his geography, and could not have put the ordinary Tanais here, nor is any other to be heard of[1]. The asyndeton is also ugly; perhaps the first letter should be detached as τ', and the rest conceals some corruption.

But there is more dislocation and corruption in the passage. Line 751 does not fit on to either 750, or, after that has gone to its own place, to 749; it can only go properly after 747. Then ὃν in 752 will articulate with ποταμοῖο in 749, though certainly the geography will be shaky, but in the MSS. ὅν has nothing to refer to at all. 748 seems past praying for; Hermann altered Σύμης to Σίνδης, but Sinde, if there ever was such a mountain at all, is supposed by him to be on the north of the Euxine, and therefore is impossible. Nor does his καὶ εὐθαλέες λειμῶνες for the end of the line look very plausible, despite the parallel in Quintus v 77.

The result of my speculation is:

745 νέρθε δέ τοι Ἑλίκης δολιχὸς παρακέκλιται αὐχήν.
750 ἐξ οὗ Θερμώδων Φᾶσίς τ' †Ἀναΐς† τε ῥέουσιν·
746 ἔνθα δ' ὑπωρείῃσιν ἐπὶ προβλῆσι κυκλοῦνται
τηλεφανεῖς αὐλῶνες ὑπὲρ μυχὸν εὐρέα πόντου,
751 οὗ Κόλχων κλυτὰ φῦλα καὶ Ἡνιόχων καὶ Ἀβάσγων
748 †οὗ Σύμης ὄρος αἰπὺ πολύς τ' εὐθαλέα λειμών†
ἔνθα δ' Ἀράξεω ῥεῦμα μεγαβρεμέτου ποταμοῖο,
752 ὃν παραμειβόμενοι μυχάτοις ἐπεπλείομεν ὅρμοις....

It is now no longer necessary to alter ἔνθα δ' in 746.

Lith. 118 ὀφθαλμοὶ δέ μοι ὀρνίθων ἀλάληντο.

The speaker was pursuing a brace of partridges, and so eager in the pursuit that he did not see a serpent in the path. The text could only mean that his eyes wandered *from* the

[1] Better not be too sure though. "Zosimus and some of his followers mistake the Danube for the Tanais," says Gibbon in a note to the tenth chapter of the *Decline and Fall*.

birds, the opposite to the required sense; Hermann consequently reads λελίηντο. But to say that one's *eyes desire* birds is very strange, nor is the genitive after λελίηντο paralleled to my knowledge. Rather μετ' ὀρνίθων ἀλάληντο. For μετὰ with genitive in this poem see 221, 608, 668, and the corruption may have been due to the last syllable of ὀφθαλμοί. The rhythm of ὀφθαλμοὶ δέ μοι also leaves something to be desired.

Lith. 185 τάων οὐχ ἑτέρας μᾶλλον φλογὸς ἔλπομ' ἔγωγε
ἀθανάτοις οὕτω κεχαρισμένα μηρία καίειν.

Tyrwhitt long ago rightly changed φλογὸς to φλόγας. Abel follows Wiel in reading ἑτέρης φλογός, making the sentence impossible to construe, and ignoring the plural τάων. I plead guilty directly afterwards to a wicked proposal to read ὄζον for αὐτόν in 188 (*Journ. Phil.* No. 39, p. 119), but αὐτὸν ὅτις is perfectly right, for ὅτις or ὅστις in late Greek very frequently means no more than ὅς; nay, there is one instance in our texts of Homer, *Iliad* xxiii 43.

Lith. 275 ὁππότε μὴ πῦρ.

δὴ for μὴ Stephanus. An easier and better correction is μέν, which is answered by δέ in 278.

Lith. 309 ἠύτε παρθενικὴ γλαγόφρονα χερσὶν ἑλοῦσα
ἠίθεον στέρνῳ προσπτύσσεται ἱμερόεντι.

γλαγερόφρονι Tyrwhitt, ἀγανόφρονα Musgrave, μαλακόφρων Ruhnken. The rhythm of the last suggestion is not impossible for this poet. And then Abel goes and prints γλαγερόχροα! Much may be said for either Musgrave or Ruhnken, but I wonder that neither of them saw that ἀταλόφρονα was nearer the MSS. and more in accordance with Epic custom. (*Iliad* xviii 567, etc.)

Lith. 381 χρὴ δέ σε τετληῶτι νόῳ αἰνέμεν αἰεί.

κηδαινέμεν, μελεδαινέμεν, κηραινέμεν, ἀκταινέμεν, μάλα σαινέμεν, have all been proposed, but not one of them is natural or satisfactory. The context shews that the meaning should be "nurse like a baby," and, considering how like IN and M

are to each other, *ἀτιταλλέμεν* seems now to me most probable. Cf. Homer *Epigr.* iv, *ἐπὶ γούνασι μητρὸς ἀτάλλων.*

frag. 215, 3 (Abel):

χειρὶ τέ μιν ῥίπτασκε γελῶν Βαυβοῦς ὑπὸ κόλποις.

This line has been variously attacked, but without any necessity. *ῥίπτασκε* means "touzled"; see Aristoph. *Lysistrata* 26:

ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ πρᾶγμ' ἀνεζητημένον
πολλαῖσί τ' ἀγρυπνίαισιν ἐρριπτασμένον,

where the meaning of *πρᾶγμα* is plain from what has preceded. The translation of *ῥίπτασκε* by Arnobius is quite correct, "contrectat amice."

ARTHUR PLATT.

THUCYDIDEA.

i 43 (1). *ἡμεῖς δὲ περιπεπτωκότες οἷς ἐν τῇ Λακεδαίμονι αὐτοὶ προείπομεν....νῦν παρ᾽ ὑμῶν τὸ αὐτὸ ἀξιοῦμεν κομίζεσθαι.*

It is impossible to explain *περιπεπτωκότες*, which could only mean "having come to grief over the principle," whereas the sense required is "relying on it," i.e. *πεπιστευκότες*.

ii 13 (1). *τοὺς δὲ ἀγροὺς τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ οἰκίας ἦν ἄρα μὴ δηώσωσιν οἱ πολέμιοι ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, ἀφίησιν αὐτὰ δημόσια εἶναι.*

The awkwardness of *τοὺς ἀγρούς*, etc., resumed by *αὐτὰ* is nothing serious, nor is an antithesis to *οἱ πολέμιοι* necessary, and yet I cannot help feeling that Thucydides wrote *αὐτὸς*, which would be easily corrupted by the proximity of *δημόσια*.

ii 21 (2). *γῆς τεμνομένης ἐν τῷ ἐμφανεῖ, ὃ οὔπω ἑοράκεσαν οἵ γε νεώτεροι, οὐδ᾽ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι πλὴν τὰ* Μηδικά.

"Which thing the younger generation had never yet seen, nor the elder seen except the Persian invasion." What manner of sentence is this? "Except *in* the Persian invasion" is the meaning, *πλὴν ⟨κατὰ⟩ τὰ* Μηδικά.

ii 21 (3). *ᾔδον χρησμοὺς παντοίους, ὧν ἀκροᾶσθαι ὡς ἕκαστος ὥρμητο.*

ὡς is omitted by ABEFM. If we read *ὡς ἀκροᾶσθαι ἕκαστος ὥρμητο*, we slightly improve the sense, and get rid of the extremely awkward phrase *ὧν ἀκροᾶσθαι ὡς ἕκαστος ὥρμητο*. Stahl conjectures *εἷς* for *ὡς*, but that does not help much. The confusion of *ὧν* and *ὡς* is very common, and it is possible that *ὡς* got into CG from a correction of *ὧν*.

I think the sense is thus improved because the addition "which each individual was eager to hear" is rather superfluous, whereas "giving them the turn each wanted to hear" suits the sarcastic tone of Thucydides in speaking of such things as oracles.

ii 48 (3). *αὐτός τε νοσήσας καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν ἄλλους πάσχοντας*. Stephanus informs the anxious enquirer that "invenitur *ὁ πάσχων* ap. Hippocr. et pro Aegroto, pro quo itidem dicimus interdum sermone vernaculo *Le patient*." Sophocles again says: "*To be sick* = *νοσέω*. *Sent.* 174, 7. 187, 11." I have recently looked about a good deal in Hippocrates without finding an instance, but my impression is that I have met with it in him more than once in former days. But the ordinary phrases are *ὁ κάμνων*, *ὁ νοσέων*, *ὁ ἀρρωστέων*, *ὁ ἀσθενέων*, *ὁ ἄνθρωπος*. Why then did Thucydides use the rare *πασχοντας* in this passage? Because, I think, he meant not so much "sick" as "being medically treated." *ὁ δρῶν* is "the operator" (e.g. Hipp. vol. iii, p. 49), *ὁ πάσχων* "the patient." Aretaeus however (Kühn, p. 64) certainly uses *τοῦ πάσχοντος* simply for "the sick man." Cf. p. 7: *νέοι δὲ τουτέων ἧσσον πάσχουσι μᾶλλον δὲ θνήσκουσι, ἀκμάζοντες ἥκιστα· γέροντες δὲ πάντων μᾶλλον καὶ πάσχουσι καὶ θνήσκουσι*, and pp. 86, 87, 89, etc. The meaning of "the patient" is more prominent in Dioscorides (vol. ii, p. 157), *καταχριέσθω ὁ πάσχων*.

There can be no doubt that *πάσχοντας* is right in the Thucydidean passage in some such medical sense.

With regard to the double *αὐτός* ("if I must be speaking on this subject," as Miss Bates said), I do not feel that it is in need of correction. There is a certain touch of temper in what Thucydides says about speculation on the cause of the plague; "I don't know about your philosophic theories, I stick to facts"; this seems to indicate some possible conflict between the historian and the medicals, who may have criticized him as a layman talking of what he did not understand. Might he not retort: "I have some right to speak of what I do know; I caught the plague myself and with my own eyes saw others undergoing your treatment"?

vi 12. *καὶ ταῦτα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν δίκαιον ἐνθάδε ἀναλοῦν, καὶ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἀνδρῶν φυγάδων τῶνδε ἐπικουρίας δεομένων.*

Nicias opposes the scheme of going to help the Leontines and Egestaeans. "*φυγάδων*—an exaggeration: only the Leontines could be called *φυγάδες*." Marchant. The exaggeration is due to a misreading, I believe; *τῶνδε* should be *τῶν δὲ* and the construction is *ἀνδρῶν ⟨τῶν μὲν⟩ φυγάδων τῶν δὲ ἐπικουρίας δεομένων*. Then *τῶν μὲν* was suppressed by the common Greek idiom. This suits the facts precisely; the scheme was to restore the Leontines, and to help the Egestaeans against Selinus, but it was the Egestaeans alone who had sent ambassadors to Athens and were begging for aid. So Nicias means: "don't waste your resources over men who are some of them exiles and others in need of help," neither party any use to Athens.

vi 16 (2). *νόμῳ μὲν γὰρ τιμὴ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δρωμένου καὶ δύναμις ἅμα ὑπονοεῖται.*

Alcibiades speaks of his magnificent display at Olympia. "The Greeks gained an exaggerated idea of the power of Athens *τῷ ἐμῷ διαπρεπεῖ τῆς Ὀλυπίαζε θεωρίας*." The visible splendour impressed them and made them suspect the resources of Athens to be inexhaustible. What then is *δρωμένου*? Simply an instance of the common confusion between *ὁρᾶν* and *δρᾶν*[1]. For it is ridiculous to speak of a victory in the chariot-race as a *δρώμενον* from which the military and naval power of a state may be inferred. From such a *δρώμενον* you can only infer a win at other games in the future. But people do infer *δύναμις* from what they see, and it is the "splendour of his show" that Alcibiades insists on.

Perhaps it is because of this false reading that the translators and commentators whom I have looked at mistake the force of the whole sentence. "A new disguise of the old opposition between *λόγῳ* and *ἔργῳ*," says Jowett, who would say anything; *νόμος* is the opposite to *φύσις*, not to *ἔργον*. "For such things are by recognized usage an honour, while *practically* power

[1] Mr Richards has anticipated me in this proposal (*C.Q.* April 1914, p. 77), but does not discuss the passage at any length.

also is supposed to be in the background," translates A. H. Wratislaw (*J. P.* No. 11, p. 96), but "practically" and "supposed" cut each other's throats. Others ignore *μὲν* and *δὲ* altogether. But if you read *ὁρωμένου* and look at the particles it is easy enough. "*Though* such things are only conventionally (not naturally) a distinction (for the glorification of Derby winners and the like must appear absurd to a sober historian), *yet* there is something in it after all; from the visible display of splendour such as mine men infer that Athens must have vast resources." Even if *δρωμένου* be kept, that is the meaning that must be extracted, but *δρώμενον* and *δύναμις* are a false antithesis.

vi 31 (3). *καὶ ἐς τὰ μακρότατα προθυμηθέντος ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ὅπως αὐτῷ τινι εὐπρεπείᾳ τε ἡ ναῦς μάλιστα προέξει καὶ τῷ ταχυναυτεῖν.*

The scholiast thought *ἐς τὰ μακρότατα* worth explaining, *ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον*. It looks to me very strange, and I should greatly prefer *ἐς τὰ ἀκρότατα*. Would not *προθυμία μακροτάτη* be a great deal more startling than *προθυμία ἀκροτάτη*?

vi 32 (3). *τῶν μὲν πιστευόντων τὰ περὶ τῆς στρατείας τῆς τῶν Ἀθηναίων, τῶν δὲ τὰ ἐναντία λεγόντων.*

The lexica quote nothing to justify *πιστεύειν τὰ περὶ τῆς στρατείας*. Gertz ejects *τὰ...Ἀθηναίων*. But the right correction is *πιστούντων*.

vii 2 (4). *τῷ δὲ ἄλλῳ τοῦ κύκλου πρὸς τὸν Τρώγιλον ἐπὶ τὴν ἑτέραν θάλασσαν λίθοι τε παραβεβλημένοι τῷ πλέονι ἤδη ἦσαν καὶ ἔστιν ἃ καὶ ἡμίεργα τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐξειργασμένα κατελέλειπτο.* (So Cobet, *κατελείπετο, κατελίπετο* MSS.)

The words *ἄλλῳ τοῦ κύκλου* are a notorious crux. For *ἄλλῳ ⟨ἀπὸ⟩* or *ἀπὸ* in place of *ἄλλῳ* nothing is to be said; Marchant's *ἄλλῳ ⟨ἄνω⟩ τοῦ κύκλου* or Hude's *ἄνω τοῦ κύκλου* both make sense, and one or other may be right, while Stahl ejects *τοῦ κύκλου πρὸς τὸν Τρώγιλον*, but is not *ἁπλῷ* [*τοῦ κύκλου*] really more likely? For the corruption of *ἁπλῷ* to *ἄλλῳ* see e.g. Adam on Plato *Rep.* 396 E. Once this had taken place, *τοῦ κύκλου* was added by a bad conjecture, being intended to mean

"the rest of the line of circumvallation." Thucydides has just spoken of the διπλοῦν τεῖχος running down to the great harbour; he would naturally go on to speak of the *single* wall in the opposite direction. Both Marchant's and Hude's proposals make him describe this direction three times over, first to the north, secondly towards Trogilus, thirdly to the "other sea," and this seems overdoing it a little.

vii 13 (2). τῶν ναυτῶν τῶν μὲν διὰ φρυγανισμὸν καὶ ἁρπαγὴν καὶ ὑδρείαν μακρὰν ὑπὸ τῶν ἱππέων ἀπολλυμένων.

Critics fall upon the opening words of this sentence, and rightly too, but it seems to me that they have overlooked a strange thing in this use of μακράν. I look in vain for good grounds for a belief that ὑδρεία μακρὰ in Attic prose can mean "watering far off." μακρὰ κέλευθος is right enough, but a long journey is one thing and "long watering" is another. It is said that μακραὶ ἐπιβοήθειαι in Xen. *Cyr.* v iv 47 means "aid brought from a distance," but that is only a polite fiction; the words mean "it is a long way to come to the rescue," which is quite another story. Certainly τὰ μακρότατα ἰδομένων in Herodotus ii 32 does mean "having seen the remotest parts," but that is not Attic prose, nor is τὰ μακρότατα by any means as difficult a phrase as ὑδρεία μακρά. Even in poetry there seems to be only τὴν μακρὰν ἀποικίαν at *P. V.* 814, and that is much softened by the fact that μακρὰν ἀποικεῖν would be a natural phrase for "to emigrate a long way"—not of course that μακρὰν is an adverb in the Aeschylean line. μακρὰν ἀποικῶν Pytho frag. Agen.

I do think then that this μακρὰν is quite as suspicious as τῶν ναυτῶν τῶν μέν. And when one looks back at 4 (6), τῷ τε γὰρ ὕδατι σπανίῳ χρώμενοι καὶ οὐκ ἐγγύθεν, καὶ ἐπὶ φρυγανισμὸν ἅμα ὁπότε ἐξέλθοιεν οἱ ναῦται, ὑπὸ τῶν ἱππέων...διεφθείροντο, one's suspicion is further heightened. Here οὐκ ἐγγύθεν corresponds to μακράν, leading us to suppose that μακρὰν should be an adverb. If so it must have once had a verb to go with, and in 4 (6) there is the verb close by, ἐξέλθοιεν.

Consequently I suspect that the sentence was something like τῶν μὲν ναυτῶν (Fr. Müller) διὰ φρυγανισμὸν καὶ ἁρπαγὴν

καὶ ὑδρείαν μακρὰν ⟨ἐξιόντων καὶ⟩ ὑπὸ τῶν ἱππέων ἀπολλυμένων.

At first sight we might conjecture *τῶν ναυτῶν ⟨ἐξιόν⟩των μὲν...ὑπὸ ⟨δὲ⟩ τῶν ἱππέων*, but the use of *μὲν* and *δὲ* would be impossible here. It may be added that "to perish on account of collecting fuel etc." is a queer sort of thing to say.

vii 67 (2). *οἳ οὐδ' ὅπως καθεζομένους χρὴ τὸ βέλος ἀφεῖναι εὑρήσουσι.*

The javelin-throwers, being crowded on the decks, will not be able to throw their darts. But what is *καθεζομένους*? "As they must be sitting still, in a manner, in one spot," says Arnold, visibly perturbed as well he may be. It is obvious to common sense that men throwing missiles do not sit in any manner or in any one spot; they take a run, bend down, and rise to their height after their discharge. Look at an athlete "putting the weight." But you say there was no room to take a run, and that is just the point on which Thucydides insists. Then why "sitting," why not "standing"? It does not require much thought to discover that fifty men sitting take up more room than fifty men standing, and therefore it is false rhetoric under the circumstances to say *καθεζομένους* instead of *ἑστῶτας*. Moreover if Thucydides had meant "sitting" he would surely have said *καθημένους*. Consider again the position of the word in the sentence. If the meaning were "*because* they are sitting," would not the order be *οἳ καθεζόμενοι οὐδ' ὅπως χρή*? Put where it is, the emphasis on *καθεζομένους* is marked.

Now it is not disputed that *καθεζομένους may* be an aorist, though it may also be a present; see Liddell and Scott. If it is a present here, I do not see how any sense can be got out of it. If it is an aorist, and I doubt whether in Thucydides it is ever anything else, the natural way to translate *καθεζομένους χρὴ ἀφεῖναι* is "they must sit down before throwing." So for instance Homer *Od.* xv 78, 79:

> *ἀμφότερον, κῦδός τε καὶ ἀγλαΐη καὶ ὄνειαρ,*
> *δειπνήσαντας ἴμεν πολλὴν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν.*

This gorgeous language does not mean that it is a fine thing

to take a journey after breakfast, but that it is a fine thing to have breakfast before you take a *long* journey, *πολλὴν* thus being very much to the point.

But this obvious translation of *καθεζομένους* is even greater nonsense than before. Is there then a less obvious way of taking it? I venture to think that there is. Before throwing a weapon a man stoops down, he does actually assume an attitude of sitting "in a manner." No doubt he would like a bit of a run as well, but crowded as these soldiers will be upon the decks they will not be able to get a run, they will not be able even to stoop down before throwing, and so *οὐδὲ* becomes also intelligible. Look at men putting the weight. For the meaning I ascribe to *καθεζομένους* compare *Iliad* xxii 275, *ἕζετο γὰρ προϊδὼν τὸ δ' ὑπέρπτατο χάλκεον ἔγχος*, which certainly does not mean that Hector sat down upon the ground, nor even, I think, that he knelt on one knee as Dr Leaf appears to suggest. Seeing a spear coming at him, he would naturally stoop as if to sit down.

If this sense of the words be admitted, the whole clause gives a perfectly good meaning, and it is the only way of taking it which I can see.

In Hdt. vi 78, *πολλῷ δέ τι πλέονας ἐς τὸ ἄλσος τοῦ Ἄργου καταφυγόντας περιιζόμενοι ἐφύλασσον* is wrongly read; *περιεζόμενοι* should be accepted from ABC.

vii 72 (2). *νεκρῶν μὲν πέρι ἢ ναυαγίων οὐδ' ἐπενόουν αἰτῆσαι ἀναίρεσιν.*

Omit *ἢ ναυαγίων*, for it is clear that under no circumstances could the Athenians have asked the Syracusans to restore them their wrecks. The words were added because we have just been told that the enemy did pick up *τά τε ναυάγια καὶ τοὺς νεκρούς*[1].

The bodies would be those upon the wrecks. Modern Greek historians seem to think that a dead body floats on the day of death. Xenophon was a practical man and knew what he was talking about; not one word does he say about floating

[1] It is true that in ii 92 we read *τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ τὰ ναυάγια...ἀνείλοντο, καὶ τοῖς ἐναντίοις τὰ ἐκείνων ὑπόσπονδα ἀπέδοσαν.* But there too, in spite of the awkward expression, *τὰ ἐκείνων* can only refer to the bodies, as Crawley sees.

dead bodies at Arginusae. But, on the face of it, it does at first sight seem as if Thucydides spoke of such miracles. i 50, *πρὸς τὰ ναυάγια καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς σφετέρους ἐτράποντο*, i 51, *διὰ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ναυαγίων προσκομισθεῖσαι κατέπλεον*, viii 106, *καὶ τὰ ναυάγια προσαγαγόμενοι καὶ νεκροὺς τοῖς ἐναντίοις ὑποσπόνδους ἀποδόντες*. But in the first and third of these passages the dead bodies are those on the wrecks, and in the second the ships are brought ashore "through the bodies and wrecks," i.e. hauled up through the shallow water close inshore, where bodies might well enough be lying; at least I see no other explanation. Cf. Hdt. viii 12, *οἱ δὲ νεκροὶ καὶ τὰ ναυήγια ἐξεφορέοντο ἐς τὰς Ἀφέτας, καὶ περί τε τὰς πρῴρας τῶν νεῶν εἱλέοντο καὶ ἐτάρασσον τοὺς ταρσοὺς τῶν κωπέων*.

Classen would like to omit *αἰτῆσαι ἀναίρεσιν*, simply because "bei uns wenigstens wäre der kurze Ausdruck kräftiger." This would enable us to keep *ἢ ναυαγίων*, if we can construe *ἐπενόουν* simply by "cared" or "thought," but I doubt this is not possible; we should rather require *ἐπεμελοῦντο*.

vii 86 (5). *ἥκιστα δὴ ἄξιος ὢν τῶν γε ἐπ' ἐμοῦ Ἑλλήνων ἐς τοῦτο δυστυχίας ἀφικέσθαι διὰ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐς ἀρετὴν νενομισμένην ἐπιτήδευσιν*.

Abundance of ink has been shed over this famous epitaph upon Nicias, but I have not met with what I think to be the true explanation of its insertion. It appears to me to be, at any rate largely, intended as a sarcastic reflection upon the popular belief in Providence. The fate of Nicias may well point to the same moral as Job draws from his own sufferings, that the gods do not by any means make a rule of rewarding virtue, even if a man's virtue cover the whole field as generally understood in relation to both gods and men. Though the gods are not mentioned here, every one would naturally think of them in the case of Nicias, and *πᾶσαν* is put in to include *ὁσιότης* as well as *ἡ ἄλλη ἀρετή*.

νενομισμένην seems to me to be added in a similar desponding spirit. It can only agree with *ἀρετήν*, and it suggests that human ideas about what *ἀρετὴ* really is are doubtful enough.

ARTHUR PLATT.

THE COMPOSITION AND CHRONOLOGY OF THE *THOUGHTS* OF MARCUS AURELIUS

There are many questions in connexion with the dating and genesis of this work which still await solution, but the main problem has recently been attacked by Professor Schenkl[1] and Dr Breithaupt[2] with a considerable measure of success. It is pretty obvious that the work was not composed as a whole *currente calamo*. But was it written consecutively like a sort of religious diary, or were disconnected jottings afterwards collected and edited by the author himself?

There is no very explicit information on these points to be found in the book itself, excepting perhaps the rather enigmatical inscriptions Τὰ ἐν Κουάδοις πρὸς τῷ Γρανούᾳ α′ and Τὰ ἐν Καρνούντῳ, found the one between the first and second and the other between the second and third books. They are generally affixed to the end of the first and second books respectively, but the lost Palatine MS, as represented by Xylander's edition, in which alone they are found, distinctly places the second inscription at the head of book III. In the case of the first its evidence is not conclusive, for it unites the three opening sections of the second book to the first, inserting the words Τὰ ἐν Κουάδοις κ.τ.λ. between I. 17 and II. 1. Moreover, as Gataker pointed out, τὰ in such a case should refer to what follows not to what precedes. Dr Breithaupt aptly instances the heading of Odyssey III, Τὰ ἐν Πύλῳ.

[1] Berliner Philol. Wochenschrift 30, p. 384; Wiener Studien 1912 XXXIV, Pt 1; Marci Antonini in semet ipsum, Lips. Teubner 1913.

[2] De M. Aurelii Antonini Commentariis Quaestiones Selectae. Dissertatio inauguralis. Gottingen 1913.

The Gran flows into the Danube at what was the extreme north-eastern corner of Pannonia Inferior. The Roman head-quarters in the Marcomannic war were at Carnuntum, a central point well chosen for holding in check the Marcomanni on their left front and the Quadi on their right. Eutropius (VIII. 3) tells us that Marcus after making Carnuntum his base of operations for three years continuously brought the war to an end. These three years would naturally be 170–172, for Marcus and Lucius Verus left Aquileia for Rome in January 169, Lucius dying on the journey, and Marcus set out again for the seat of war at the end of the same year.

But we do not know how soon the Romans found themselves strong enough to cross the Danube and strike the Gran higher up in the enemy's country. For a time at least they must have been fully occupied in concentrating at Carnuntum and organizing their offensive campaign. If then book II was written before book III, which its position would lead us to suppose, we cannot put its composition much earlier than 171, in the first stages of the struggle with the Quadi. This people however after being forced to submit seem to have taken up arms again in 174, the year to which the "miraculous victory" is usually assigned. Consequently there is nothing in the inscription Τὰ ἐν Κουάδοις to prevent us dating the book to which it is prefixed as late as 174, and indeed there have been found some, I think, to take that expression as having a reference to the *νίκη παράδοξος* itself[1]. But the earlier date would seem more probable.

If the third book was composed after the second, and as the superscription tells us at Carnuntum, it must have followed closely upon the second, and been written about 172.

We will next consider what reasons, if any, we have for supposing that books II–XII were written in the order in which

[1] Nothing is known as to the locality of this famous incident, but perhaps the mention of the Cotini in the apocryphal letter of Marcus to the Senate gives us a clue. They were separated from the watershed of the Gran by the Carpathians. An unexpected rising of the Quadi might well have taken by surprise a Roman army in their country, and this consideration favours the date 174, which rests on the express statement by Dio (72. 10 § 4) that Marcus was hailed Imperator for the seventh time after this victory.

we have them. In the first place they begin and end in a manner strikingly appropriate to a single and connected work. "Ἔωθεν, from the dawn of day—from the dawn of life—be prepared to have your philosophy put to the test and, when your warfare is accomplished and your service ended, ἄπιθι ἵλεως· καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἀπολύων ἵλεως." From a stirring *adsurge* we are brought to how tranquil and gracious a *nunc dimittis*.

In the second place, as Dr Breithaupt has well shewn, a comparison of certain quotations from Euripides (VII. 38–41 : XI. 6), Epictetus (IV. 41 : IX. 24; VII. 63 : XI. 18), and Heracleitus (IV. 46 : VI. 42) tends to convince us that in each case the passage in the later book was written subsequently to the passage in the earlier, for the quotation when repeated is woven more closely into the context and does not appear with the author's name as a separate citation. Thus we gather that IV. 46 was written before VI. 42, IV. 41 before IX. 24, VII. 38, 40, 41 before XI. 6, and VII. 63 before XI. 18. The presumption then is that books IV, VI, VII, IX, XI were composed in that order, that is, if each book may be taken as a separate entity.

Certain passages however, which Dr Breithaupt dismisses as throwing no light on the enquiry, seem as far as they go to tell against his argument. In VII. 33 speaking of pain, Marcus says τὸ μὲν ἀφόρητον ἐξάγει, τὸ δὲ χρονίζον φορητόν, a thought as old as Aeschylus but here obviously taken from Epicurus, as the parallel passage (VII. 64) shews: ἐπὶ τῶν πλείστων πόνων καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἐπικούρου σοι βοηθείτω ὅτι οὐκ ἀφόρητον οὔτε αἰώνιον. Again in VIII. 41 we have the line ὅταν γένηται σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μένει[1], whereas in XII. 3 Empedocles is named as the author of σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μονίῃ περιηγέι (MS. περιήθει) γαίων.

In the third place we constantly find a thought echoed in a subsequent section, or in some cases taken up and expanded. The relative priority of such passages will, it must be admitted, rest on the reader's individual impression and is not a matter susceptible of exact proof. Dr Breithaupt quotes one or two

[1] But it cannot be certainly assumed that this is a quotation from Empedocles. With σφαῖρα for σφαῖρος we get a senarius.

striking instances, such as *ὕβριζε σεαυτήν, ὦ ψυχή* (II. 6) = *ὑβρίζει ἑαυτὴν ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχή* (II. 16), and *γυμνὰ τῶν ὑλικῶν ἀγγείων καὶ φλοίων* (XII. 2) = *γυμνὰ τῶν φλοίων* (XII. 8) where the second passage strikes one as a reminiscence of the first. We may add *μὴ μέλαν ἦθος περιβλέπεσθαι* (IV. 18), which leads up to the lurid picture in IV. 28 of what a "black character" can be. Again the thought expressed in VII. 14, 16, that the body which feels pain can complain if it choose, but the Master-Reason which constitutes the real man remains unaffected, is more briefly expressed in VIII. 28, which reads like an allusion to what was said more at large previously. We do not often find Marcus, like Seneca, speaking with divergent voices, but there does seem some difficulty in reconciling III. 5 *ὀρθὸν οὖν εἶναι χρὴ οὐκ ὀρθούμενον* with VII. 12 *ὀρθὸς ἢ ὀρθούμενος*, and Casaubon in consequence wished to write *μὴ* for *ἤ*, but the later version appears to be a maturer and more considered judgment, having reference, I think, to the *μὴ αἰσχύνου βοηθούμενος* of V. 7.

These instances, and they could be greatly amplified, are enough to raise a presumption, which a consecutive perusal of the whole work intensifies to something like a conviction, that the books of the *Thoughts*, with the exception of book I, which will be considered later, were composed substantially in the traditional order.

As to the dates at which the separate books were written we have shewn some reason for thinking that books II and III were written about 171–173, and it remains to consider whether in the absence of other indications there is any internal evidence bearing on the date of the other books.

In this connexion Dr Breithaupt lays some stress on allusions in several places to the Court (*αὐλή*) as necessarily implying residence at Rome. The passages in question are I. 17 § 8 *ἐν αὐλῇ βιοῦντα*, "one who lives in a Court"; V. 16 *ἐν αὐλῇ δὲ ζῆν ἐστιν· ἔστιν ἄρα καὶ εὖ ζῆν ἐν αὐλῇ*: VI. 12 where contrasting a stepmother and a mother he says *τοῦτό σοι νῦν ἐστιν ἡ αὐλὴ καὶ ἡ φιλοσοφία*: VIII. 9 *μηκέτι σου μηδεὶς ἀκούσῃ καταμεμφομένου τὸν ἐν αὐλῇ βίον*. To these he adds IV. 3 § 3 *πᾶσαν αὐλὴν ἀποκλεῖσαι*, accepting Lofft's plausible emendation

for *αὐτὴν* (Cas. *ἀυτήν*) which appears in all our MSS[1]. None of these seems to require for the writer a residence in Rome at the time. Moreover *αὐλὴ* signifies entourage more than locale, as we see from VIII. 31, and that the word does not necessarily connote residence at Rome is, I think, shewn *inter alia* by the letter of Irenaeus to Florinus (Euseb. V. 20): *εἶδον γάρ σε παῖς ὢν ἐν τῇ κάτω Ἀσίᾳ παρὰ Πολυκάρπῳ λαμπρῶς πράττοντα ἐν τῇ βασιλικῇ αὐλῇ*[2]. The Court which Marcus, accompanied by his wife, held at Sirmium in 170 (Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* II. 241) could be termed an *αὐλὴ* as truly as the Court he kept at Rome.

The bare mention of speaking in the Senate (VIII. 30) which Dr Breithaupt adduces as evidence of residence in the Capital cannot be held to be of any weight in determining the *locus scribendi* of the book in question. Nor can anything be inferred one way or the other from the mention of Augustus, Trajan, Hadrian and Pius in books IV, VI, VIII, IX, X and their exclusion from II and III. Of still less account is the reference (XII. 27) to Stertinius at Baiae and Tiberius at Capreae. Allusions to acting, dancing, athletic games, gladiators and bestiarii occur throughout, except in books II, IV, and VIII, but no argument can be based on this.

Because the VIIth and XIth books abound in quotations from ancient authors (the latter having also the disquisition on tragedy and comedy) it has been suggested that these books were most likely written at Rome, but there is no reason to suppose that Marcus when he went to the war left all his books behind. He speaks of his books (II. 2, 3) while actually, it seems, in the enemy's country. We may be certain that he had with him at least his own volumes of extracts (III. 14) and probably some Gnomologia.

Apart from the above vague indications of date and place

[1] The Palatine MS. and C also have *ἀποκλύσαι*. I cannot think *αὐλὴν* is right. The omission of the article is difficult if not impossible to justify and is by no means paralleled by the *αὐλὴν ὅλην* of X. 27. In any case no argument can be based on a disputed reading.

[2] It has been disputed what this *βασιλικὴ αὐλὴ* was, but both Aristides (I. 453 Dind.) and Malalas (XI. 280) apparently refer to a visit of Pius, and therefore of Marcus too (see Capit. VII. 2), to Syria about 153.

there are certain definite facts mentioned in the work which enable us to get a *terminus a quo* for the composition of it or parts of it. The mother of Marcus died about 156, and her death is alluded to in VIII. 25 and IX. 21. Pius died 7 March 161, and he was obviously dead when IV. 33, VI. 30, VIII. 25, IX. 21, X. 27 and I. 16 were written. Lucius Verus died in January 169, and not only is he spoken of as dead (VIII. 37) but apparently also his concubine Pantheia and his favourite Pergamus, who were likely in the nature of things to have outlived him many years. The eighth book therefore could not have been written before 170 at the earliest.

At this date Marcus would not have been quite 50, yet even in the IInd book he calls himself *γέρων* (II. 2). A few sections later (II. 6) he says *οὗτος δέ σοι (ὁ βίος) σχεδὸν διήνυσται*, and in V. 31 *πλήρης ἤδη σοι ἡ ἱστορία τοῦ βίου καὶ τελεία* (*τελέα* P, *τελευτᾷ* Schenkl) *ἡ λειτουργία*. He mentions his old age again in IX. 21 (cp. III. 14) though *γῆρας* here may be loosely used. Old age was usually taken to begin at 56. The concluding words of book XII are those of one who is taking a farewell of life.

If, as I hope to make probable later, the IXth book was written in 175, books IV–VIII would fall between 173 and 175 and so have been written at the seat of war[1].

Books IV, V, VI, VII give no clue, except possibly in the mention of *βαρβάρων ἔθνη ποικίλα* (VII. 48), as to where they were written, for to connect the Athenian prayer for rain in V. 7 with the "Rain-Wonder," as has been done, is purely fanciful, far more fanciful, for instance, than to see in the *ῥιγῶν*, *θαλπόμενος*, and *νυστάζων* of VI. 2 allusions respectively to the campaigns on the frozen Danube (cp. Dio 71. 5 § 17, 7 § 1), to

[1] A coin of Marcus dated 174 (Cohen 361) and having on the reverse *Adventus Aug* has been adduced as evidence of the return of Marcus to Rome for a few months at least of this year. But the testimony of Dio (71. 32 § 1) is against this, and the words can be taken, some think, as a pious wish. Possibly he intended to return, the coin being struck in anticipation, but was prevented by the sudden rising of the Quadi mentioned above. If he returned at all, it must have been in the earlier part of the year, as the *Imp VI* on the coin shews; for after the "Miraculous Victory" in the summer of that year he was hailed Imperator for the seventh time.

the *καῦμα καὶ δίψος* of the sensational battle against the Quadi (Dio 71. 8 § 2), and to the fact recorded by Galen of Marcus (XIV. 2 Kühn) that *συνέβαινεν αὐτῷ νυστάζειν καρωδῶς ἐν ταῖς ὁσημέραις πράξεσιν*, the drowsiness being due, as he tells us, to the theriac opiate which he prescribed for the Emperor.

While at Rome we know that Marcus always made time for study. In the earliest years of his rule, when overwhelmed with the cares of State, he was able to snatch a few moments for reading *quasi furtim, certe quidem raptim* (Fronto, *ad Anton.* II. 1). When getting an old man he attended the lectures of Sextus the Boeotian, saying in his defence *καλὸν καὶ γηράσκοντι τὸ μανθάνειν* (Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* II. 9, p. 557 Kays.). When therefore he writes (VIII. 8) *ἀναγινώσκειν οὐκ ἔξεστιν*, this seems to imply that he was engaged in still more imperative and engrossing duties, which could only be the conduct of the war on the Danube. War he reckons (X. 9) as one of the things capable of daily effacing *τὰ ἱερὰ ἐκεῖνα δόγματα, ὅποσα ἀφυσιολογήτως φαντάζῃ καὶ παραπέμπεις*. Such was its moral effect. Its intellectual effect must have been at least as great. In one place he even implies that he will never have time to read his own memoranda and extracts. The words were probably written at Carnuntum in 173: *οὔτε τὰ ὑπομνηματιά σου μέλλεις ἀναγινώσκειν οὔτε τὰς τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων πράξεις καὶ τὰς ἐκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων ἐκλογάς, ἃς ἐς τὸ γῆρας ἑαυτῷ ἀπετίθεσο* (III. 14). It is not quite clear what Marcus meant by *ὑπομνημάτια*, a diminutive of the *ὑπομνήματα* which he applies to the discourses of Epictetus (I. 7 *ad fin.*), nor whether he had himself written a history of the ancient Greeks and Romans. If *ὑπομνημάτια*, which in spite of the Stoic use of diminutives seems to me to have a touch of self-depreciation, refers to the *Thoughts* themselves as seems quite possible, then the historical work mentioned, placed as it is between two of the Emperor's own writings, must also be taken to be an unknown work of his[1].

[1] Unless the *βιβλίον πασῆς κοσμικῆς ἐμπειρίας καὶ παιδείας μεστόν* attributed by Nicephorus Callistus (III. 31) in the 14th century to Marcus be a confused reference to this work. Nicephorus says it was written for the instruction of Commodus.

On the other hand Marcus thanks the Gods (I. 17 *ad fin.*) *μὴ ἀποκαθίσαι ἐπὶ τοὺς συγγραφεῖς* (*τοῦ* or *τὸ συγγράφειν*, Reiske) but the reading is not certain, and Fronto (*ad Caes.* IV. 3 *ad fin.*) tells us that Marcus early had a wish to write history.

A distinct allusion to the battlefield occurs in VIII. 34: *εἰ ποτε εἶδες χεῖρα ἀποκεκομμένην ἢ πόδα, ἢ κεφαλὴν ἀποτετμημένην χωρὶς ποὺ ποτε ἀπὸ τοῦ λοιποῦ σώματος κειμένην.* The panels of the Aurelian Column shew more than one such scene (see Domaszewski, Plate 61; Bartoli, Plates 41, 45).

Marcus had no need to learn "from Catulus" or any other "to love his children truly" (I. 13). Fronto tells us (*ad Caes.* IV. 12) in hyperbolic terms what the little Faustina was to her father. The enemies of Herodes even tried to work upon this paternal fondness to prejudice Marcus against Herodes (Philost. *Vit. Soph.* II. 241 Kays.). In the case of Commodus his natural affection for his only surviving son led him on one occasion at least to shew deplorable weakness (Lampr. *Vit. Comm.* II. 7). When he says therefore (VIII. 49) *βλέπω ὅτι νοσεῖ τὸ παιδίον. βλέπω· ὅτι δὲ κινδυνεύει οὐ βλέπω*, he may have had in mind a specific case of illness. Commodus was placed in Galen's professional charge, and there are apparently two illnesses of his mentioned by the latter, one when his father was at Rome and one when he was away, *κατὰ τὴν ἐπιδημίαν ἐκείνου* (XIV. 651 Kühn), and *ἀποδημοῦντος τοῦ πατρος* (XIV. 661 K.). An inscription found at Tibur (*C. I. G.* 1124) possibly refers to an illness of Fadilla[1]. Marcus recurs to the same thought in IX. 40, where he says that a man should not pray *πῶς μὴ ἀποβαλῶ τὸ τεκνίον* but rather *πῶς μὴ φοβηθῶ ἀποβαλεῖν*. He shewed his philosophic calm on the loss of his son Annius Verus at Praeneste after an operation. This was in the last months of 169 when he was starting for the war (Capit. XXI. 3). A passage that deserves careful consideration is to be found in IX. 3: *ὡς νῦν περιμένεις πότε ἔμβρυον ἐκ τῆς γαστρὸς τῆς γυναικος σου ἐξέλθῃ*. The last child born to Marcus, as far as we know, was Vibia Aurelia Sabina, whose birth took place 166–7, and if the second person of *περιμένεις* is taken as a reference to the writer

[1] Cp. also the probably apocryphal letter of Faustina to Marcus in Vulcat. Gallicanus (*Vit. Av. Cassii* x. 6).

himself then this book must be dated at least as early as 167. But to me the words read as purely generic, "thou" meaning any individual taken as an example. Moreover in spite of the frequent omission of the article by Marcus it would seem absolutely necessary here if he is definitely speaking of a child then in his wife's womb. Marcus, according to his biographer (*Vit. Mar.* XXIX. 10), took a concubine to wife after Faustina's death in 176, but we hear nothing of any children by her.

Book IX appears to me to contain some indications that it was written during or soon after the revolt of Cassius in 175. In the first place there is in IX. 3 *ad fin.* that remarkable apostrophe to Death, "come quickly lest I too forget myself": *νῦν δ' ὁρᾷς ὅσος ὁ κόπος ἐν τῇ διαφωνίᾳ τῆς συμβιώσεως, ὥστε εἰπεῖν "θᾶττον ἔλθοις, ὦ Θάνατε, μή που καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιλάθωμαι ἐμαυτοῦ."* Light is perhaps thrown on this very unusual outburst by what Dio (71. 20 § 2) tells us that, when the Senate demurred to a general amnesty for the followers of Cassius, Marcus wrote to them *Ἂν μὴ τούτου τύχω σπεύσω* (Joh. Antioch. *ἀποίσομαι*) *πρὸς τὸν θάνατον.* The imperturbability of Marcus, on which his biographers lay so much stress, broke down only on the occasion of the defection of Cassius. Dio says he was *σφόδρα ἐκπλαγείς* (71. 22 § 2).

The whole of IX. 42 again is in an unusual degree applicable to Cassius: *ὅταν τινὸς ἀναισχυντίᾳ προσκόπτῃς, εὐθὺς πυνθάνου ἑαυτοῦ· δύνανται οὖν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἀναίσχυντοι μὴ εἶναι; οὐ δύνανται...Τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ...ἀπίστου...Σὺ γὰρ καὶ ἀφορμὰς ἐκ τοῦ λόγου εἶχες πρὸς τὸ ἐνθυμηθῆναι, ὅτι εἰκός ἐστι τοῦτον τοῦτο ἁμαρτήσεσθαι, καὶ ὅμως ἐπιλαθόμενος θαυμάζεις εἰ ἡμάρτηκεν. Μάλιστα δέ, ὅταν ὡς ἀπίστῳ ἢ ἀχαρίστῳ μέμφῃ, εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐπιστρέφου. Προδήλως γὰρ σὸν τὸ ἁμάρτημα, εἴτε περὶ τοῦ τοιαύτην τὴν διάθεσιν ἔχοντος ἐπίστευσας, ὅτι τὴν πίστιν φυλάξει, εἴτε τὴν χάριν διδοὺς μὴ καταληκτικῶς ἔδωκας μηδὲ ὥστε ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς σῆς πράξεως εὐθὺς ἀπειληφέναι πάντα τὸν καρπόν.* We see how the writer specializes the *ἀναισχυντία* of the opening sentence as faithlessness and ingratitude, and harping upon this theme reproaches himself for not being true to his philosophic principles when

tested. Now set beside all this the speech to his soldiers which Dio puts into the mouth of Marcus on his being made aware of the rebellion of Cassius: *πῶς οὐκ ἀμφότερα καὶ δεινότητι καὶ ἀτοπίᾳ νικᾷ τὸ μηδὲν πιστὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἶναι καὶ ἐπιβεβουλεῦσθαί τέ με ὑπὸ τοῦ φιλτάτου;...Πῶς δ' οὐκ ἀπολωλε μὲν πίστις;...Ἐπεὶ δ' οὐκ ἄν ποτε συγκαθεῖναι ἐς τοῦτο ὁ Κάσσιος ἐθελήσειε, πῶς γὰρ ἂν πιστεύσειέ μοι, ἄπιστος αὐτῷ περὶ ἐμὲ γεγενημένος; Τί δὲ τοῦτό ἐστιν; ἀδικήσαντα ἄνθρωπον ἀφεῖναι, πρὸς φιλίαν ὑπέρβαντα φίλον μεῖναι, πίστιν καταλύσαντι πιστὸν διαγενέσθαι* (Dio 71. 24). Even if Dio made up this speech, he brought it into wonderful conformity with the inner thoughts of Marcus. That Marcus felt deeply the ingratitude of Cassius is certain, and I cannot but think that he allowed his feelings to colour the Thoughts which he presumably put on paper at the time.

In IX. 30 there is a mention of the barbarians and in X. 10 Marcus derides him who glories in having "taken Sarmatians." It was in 175 that the Emperor received the title *Sarmaticus*. The words *τοιούτου βίου ἐν ᾧ αὐτοὶ οἱ κοινωνοί, ὑπὲρ ὧν τὰ τοσαῦτα ἠγωνισάμην ηὐξάμην ἐφρόντισα, αὐτοὶ ἐκεῖνοι θέλουσί με ὑπάγειν*, evidently spoken with deep feeling, allude perhaps to Cassius and his accomplices.

This completes the available evidence for books II to XII, as to which we can now come tentatively to the conclusion that they were written as follows: book II 171–2, book III 172–3, books IV to VIII 173–175, books IX and X 175, 176, books XI, XII perhaps written at Rome in 177–8 before Marcus set out to the war for the last time. The Heads of Philosophy given in XI. 18, while certainly a summary of the philosophy as it appears in the previous books, may also have been the resumé or the text of the Emperor's lectures to his people before setting out from Rome. This unique episode, when Marcus came forward as the philosophic teacher of his people, is described by two writers: Vulc. Gallicanus (*Vit. Avid. Cass.* III. 5): *per ordinem paraeneseos* (*hoc est praeceptionum*) *per triduum disputavit*; and Aurelius Victor, who makes clear that it took place in 178 (*De Caes.* XVI. 9): *ne expeditioni aut pugnae se prius committeret quam sectarum ardua ac perocculta*

explanavisset. Ita incerta belli in eius salute doctrinae studiis metuebantur.

Before we turn to the first book, one other passage (XI. 3) calls for a few words. Here we have the notorious allusion to the Christians, and if the Lyons persecution really took place in 177, which however cannot be absolutely affirmed, it might seem as if that terrible incident was here referred to. Yet it is doubtful whether the actual words *οἱ Χριστιανοί* can be genuine. They read precisely like a gloss, being not only as they stand ungrammatical but in point of style a barbarism such as a purist in letters—and Marcus was surely that—would have eschewed no less than his model Epictetus and his contemporaries Apuleius, Aristides, Dio, and probably Galen did eschew it. We should as soon look for the word Salvationist in a stylist like our own writer Pater. But though the words may be a later addition it is quite possible that the Christians were indeed meant. The persons whom the author had in mind are accused not of obstinacy but of opposition[1], and the complaint that they did not die *λελογισμένως καὶ σεμνῶς καὶ ἀτραγῴδως* does not seem so uncalled for in the face of admissions made by Christian writers themselves, such as Eusebius (IV. 15 § 8) and Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* IV. 4)[2]. But this is not the only passage in which Marcus glances at the Christians. The latter were never tired of appealing to their power of exorcizing demons as infallible evidence of the truth of their religion, and Marcus tells us that he had been taught by Diognetus (I. 6) to disbelieve in such powers. Again in III. 16 we have *τὸ δὲ νοῦν ἡγεμόνα ἔχειν ἐπὶ τὰ φαινόμενα καθήκοντα καὶ τῶν θεοὺς μὴ νομιζόντων καὶ τῶν τὴν πατρίδα ἐγκαταλειπόντων καὶ τῶν <αἴσχιστα> ποιούντων ἐπειδὰν κλείσωσι τὰς θύρας*. Here he gives persons who are atheists, unpatriotic, and workers of (shameful) deeds in secret the credit of obeying the dictates of their conscience in doing what they deem their duty. Who can be meant if not the Christians? They were accused of

[1] This is the meaning of the word *παράταξις* as we see from VIII. 48 and also from Lucian's use of the word.

[2] Theatricality and bravado marred some of the martyrdoms in Spain under the Arabs. See the writer's *Islam and Christianity in Spain*, pp. 32 ff.

these very three things. That Marcus should commend the Christians for refusing to violate their principles need not surprise us in a Stoic who held his conscience (*τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν*) in such reverence. Celsus too, a bitter opponent of Christianity, writing possibly about 177, commends the Christians because nothing can make them renounce their doctrines (Origen, *c. Cels.* I. 8). In VII. 68 Marcus speaks with words of encouragement to persons who are cried down by all men and torn limb from limb by wild beasts. He could scarcely speak so to real criminals, and who else, except Christians, suffered these things? So far from being a bitter persecutor of the Christians it is probable that Marcus more than half sympathized with them. His attitude would most likely have been that of Rusticus, as shewn in his trial of Justin and his companions.

Lastly, there remains book I to be considered. Professor Schenkl and Dr Breithaupt have arrived independently at the conclusion that this book was in fact written last and prefixed as an introduction to the whole work. A main argument for this supposition, and one which has great weight, is that the character sketch of Antoninus Pius, so lovingly drawn in I. 16, is a conscious enlargement of the shorter, but in its chief features practically identical, portrait given in VI. 30. That the less finished picture should have followed the other is not easily conceivable. The portrait gallery, presented to us in the first book, of all those whose lives and characters had formed the mind and inspired the ideals of the writer—and it is noticeable that Hadrian and even Herodes find no place in it—forms one of the most attractive and human things in literature[1]. Different minds will take different views as to whether Marcus was more likely to have written this testimony to his teachers before beginning to pen his *Thoughts* or after he had brought his work to a close, thus designing it as a noble and appropriate introduction to the exposition of his philosophy. To myself, I confess, the latter view appeals far the more strongly. Dr Rendall

[1] It seems incredible but there have been writers who have seen in this book nothing but the self-complacency of a Pharisee parading his own virtues: as if, forsooth, Marcus claimed to possess in his own person all the good qualities which he attributes to all his teachers.

indeed expresses an opinion (*Journal of Philology* XXIII. 1895) that the first book and the earlier books in general shew less command of Greek than the later ones, and that the style of the first book in particular lacks ease and freedom. But that is not a view by any means generally taken. If the supposed fact could be proved, it would be conclusive, but the evidence for it does not appear to be very strong.

The exact date however at which the first book was composed is far from easy to determine. What bearing the mention of Faustina (I. 17 § 18) has upon this question can only be seen when it has been decided whether the words *παρὰ τῶν θεῶν... τὸ τὴν γυναῖκα τοιαύτην εἶναι* refer to Faustina as alive or dead, i.e. whether *εἶναι* is present or past. Dr Breithaupt gives us some perhaps not wholly conclusive reasons for the latter view. Still that is, I think, the natural impression which the words convey. Faustina died in the winter of 175–6.

That the book was composed late in life seems clear from I. 17 § 12 where Marcus thanks the Gods *τὸ ἀντισχεῖν τὸ σῶμα ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐν τοιούτῳ βίῳ*, where by "such a life" he obviously means the *dura mala belli* in the swamps of the Danube. His words are well illustrated by Dio, when he says (71. 36 § 3) *ἀλλ' ἔγωγε ἐξ αὐτῶν τούτων μᾶλλον αὐτὸν τεθαύμακα ὅτι ἔν τε ἀλλοκότοις καὶ ἐν ἐξαισίοις πράγμασι καὶ αὐτὸς διεγένετο καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν διεσώσατο.*

.Fronto is spoken of in I. 13, but the meagreness of the tribute to him cannot fail to surprise any one who is familiar with the correspondence between him and Marcus. We miss any allusion to the debt acknowledged in *ad Caes.* III. 12: *non hoc est quod me felicem nuncupo. Quid est igitur? Quod verum dicere ex te disco...Simul et audire verum me doces.* It is obvious, I think, that Fronto was dead at this time, but it is not known for certain when he died. The most probable date is 168. It is true that a sentence in the *De Orationibus* (Naber, p. 162), probably the last piece of Fronto's writing that we have, which alludes to *Numum Antonini aut Commodi aut Pii*, is pointed to as a proof that he survived till 177, when Commodus was associated in the Empire with Marcus. But a closer study of the letter shews that this is really impossible, and we are driven

to take *Commodi* as referring to Commodus[1] as Caesar. This dignity he attained on Oct. 12th 166.

There are still two passages which are of importance for the chronology of the book. These are where Marcus mentions Alexander the Platonist and his "brother" Severus.

In I. 12 we find Marcus thanking Alexander the Platonist (nicknamed the Clay-Plato) for teaching him "not to say to any one without necessity nor write in a letter, *I am too busy*." Now the intimacy of Marcus with this Alexander does not seem to have begun before 174 or thereabouts, when the Emperor summoned him to take up the duties of Greek Secretary to himself in Pannonia (Philost. *Vit. Soph.* II. 5. 571 Kays.). He was certainly not one of the instructors of his youth, for neither does Capitolinus mention him among the teachers of Marcus, nor was Pius likely to have chosen him to act in this capacity if the anecdote related by Philostratus, which shews what a poor impression Alexander made upon that Emperor, is authentic. We may suppose that Alexander remained with the Emperor till after the revolt of Cassius and perhaps accompanied him in his royal progress as far as Greece, and if the words of Philostratus *ἀφικόμενος δὲ ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας, ὁδοῦ δὲ μῆκος τοῦτο οὐ μέτριον τῷ ἐκ τῆς ἑῴας ἐλαύνοντι, "ἐνταῦθα," ἔφη, "γόνυ κάμψωμεν"* refer to this occasion, he would seem to have remained there. In which case I. 12 will naturally be dated after 176.

Lastly there is the reference to Severus (I. 14): *παρὰ τοῦ ἀδέλφου μου Σευήρου τὸ φιλοικεῖον καὶ φιλάληθες καὶ φιλοδίκαιον· καὶ τὸ δι' αὐτὸν (αὐτοῦ* Stich) *γνῶναι Θρασέαν, Ἑλβίδιον, Κάτωνα, Δίωνα, Βροῦτον,...καὶ ἔτι παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸ ὁμαλὲς καὶ ὁμότονον ἐν τῇ τιμῇ τῆς φιλοσοφίας.* The identification of this Severus and the true interpretation of *ἀδέλφου μου* present great difficulties. Gataker's *φίλου* for *ἀδελφου* needs only to be mentioned to be rejected. The emendation *Οὐήρου* has found defenders but cannot for a moment be accepted, in the first place because Verus is mentioned else-

[1] It is impossible to take this of L. Verus who is never called Commodus on his coins.

where (I. 17 § 6), and secondly because, though Justin calls Verus a philosopher and Fronto flatters his philosophical dilettantism (*e.g. ad Ver.* I. 1), yet it is simply absurd to suppose that Marcus learnt such lessons as are here acknowledged from one who was nine years his junior and whose tastes were as far removed from philosophy as they well could be. Others again, and Dr Breithaupt is among them, cancel the troublesome words, which are held suspect because Marcus has previously mentioned his relations in a division by themselves, and it seems out of place to insert a relative here among his teachers, and also because in the other cases, except for the purpose of differentiation, only simple names without any adjuncts are given. To these objections it may be answered that this was but a conventional relationship due to marriage and that the adjunct is for the very purpose of distinguishing this Severus from another.

But who was this Severus and why is he called "brother" by Marcus? And have the answers to these questions any bearing on the date of the book? We know from Capitolinus (*Vit. Mar.* III. 3) that Marcus was a hearer of the Peripatetic philosopher Claudius Severus, and, as the Severus here mentioned was also a philosopher, it seems natural to identify the two. Nor is it necessarily fatal to this supposition that the Severus here is said to have brought Stoic writers to his disciple's notice. For it is significant that Marcus at this point changes the *παρὰ τοῦ Σ.* to *δι' αὐτόν*, going back to *παρ' αὐτοῦ* subsequently. So it appears that he did not learn to know Thrasea and the others directly from, but only through or by reason of, Severus[1].

It is well established that a certain Claudius Severus married a daughter of Marcus. An inscription of 173 A.D. found at Pompeiopolis (*C.I.G.* 4551) runs: Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ Γν Κλαύδιον Σεβῆρον δὶς ὕπατον ποντίφικα γαμβρὸν Καίσαρος

[1] Severus is mentioned again in x. 31 where we must, I think, accept Prof. Leopold's transposition of names and read *Σευῆρον ἰδὼν Κρίτωνα ἢ Ξενοφῶντα φαντάζου*, for in the parallel clauses the philosophers mentioned as being seen are of more or less recent date. Taking the emendation, we may suppose that Severus was alive when x. 31 was written. Whether he was dead when I. 14 was written there is nothing to shew.

M. Αὐρηλίου Ἀντωνείνου Σεβαστοῦ (for Σεβήρου, Borghesi) πάτρωνα καὶ κτίστην ἡ μητρόπολις Πομπηιόπολις διὰ T. Δομετίου Αὐγουρείνου Κλαυδίου Καλβείνου πρώτου ἄρχοντος. Claudius Severus was consul a second time in 173, and a Claudius Severus, a friend of Galen, was *consul suffectus* in 163 (Galen XIV. 647, 651 Kühn). Cl. Severus accompanied Marcus to Greece (Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* II. 585 Kays.) being styled ὕπατος (which here means *consular*). If our Severus was consul in 163, he must have been advanced in years by the time he married the daughter of Marcus. It is nowhere stated which daughter this was, but as Severus was the eldest except perhaps Pompeianus of the sons-in-law of Marcus he most likely married the eldest available daughter, viz. Arria Fadilla who was born about 150[1]. This supposition receives some support from the fact that the name Fadilla appears subsequently in the pedigree of the Severi.

Now as Cn. Claud. Severus married the daughter of Marcus, the latter could quite legitimately call the father of Severus brother, and the title would be used naturally enough to distinguish him from his son, the son-in-law of Marcus. Dio (79. 5 § 4) couples Marcus and the elder Severus together in his account of Elagabalus: τοῦ γὰρ Σευήρου τοῦ Κλαυδίου καὶ τοῦ Ἀντωνείνου τοῦ Μάρκου ἀπόγονος ἦν, *sc.* Annia Faustina the wife of Pomponius Bassus, whom Elagabalus, after procuring the murder of Bassus, took as his own wife.

In default of any evidence to the contrary we may adopt the natural supposition that the Peripatetic at whose feet Marcus sat was the father of the Severus who married the daughter of Marcus[2]. As the philosophers of this age became

[1] A letter given by Vulc. Gallicanus (*Vit. Avid. Cass.* x. 6) purporting to be from Faustina to Marcus in 175 speaks of Fadilla then as *puella virgo*, but it is generally held to be spurious.

[2] But there was a Tib. (Claudius ?) Severus, a man of great distinction and character who was proconsul of Asia about 153–4 (see Arist. *Orat. Sacr.* IV), and the son of Claud. Severus, Marcus' son-in-law, was called Tiberius Claud. Severus Proculus (cons. 200). It must not be forgotten that Marcus himself was descended from Severi and himself called Catilius Severus in boyhood. By error or otherwise the name Severus occurs occasionally in connexion with Marcus in our MSS of Galen, Lampridius, and even of the jurists Papirius Justus and Paulus.

consuls and administrators, there is also no insuperable objection to our identifying Severus the philosopher with Cn. Claudius Severus (Arabianus) consul in 146. He would naturally proceed to a proconsulship about 159, and Fronto's letter, which stands first in his letters *ad Amicos*, was probably written to him at that date.

It remains to sum up the results of our enquiry. We have been led then to conclude that the book of *Thoughts* was composed by Marcus as a connected whole, books II to XII being written consecutively in that order and book I added afterwards as an introduction. The dates would be somewhat as follows:

Book II written on the Gran among the Quadi about 171–2.

Book III written at Carnuntum about 172–3.

Books IV–VIII written at the seat of war between 173 and 175.

Books IX, X written during the Cassian troubles and after 175–6.

Books XI, XII written at Rome before Marcus set out for the war in 178.

Book I written at the same time or very shortly afterwards.

The complete work was possibly left behind at Rome in safe keeping. After the death of Marcus some friendly hand, whether of Pompeianus or Victorinus or Severus, rescued it from its unworthy surroundings under Commodus and gave it to the world. Perhaps this inestimable service was performed by a daughter, Cornificia, whose only utterance that has come down to us breathes the spirit of her father's *Thoughts*. For we learn from a fragment of Dio that, when the order for her death came to her from Caracallus, she cried *ὦ δυστυχὲς ψυχίδιον ἐν πονηρῷ σώματι καθειργμένον, ἔξελθε ἐλευθερώθητι, δεῖξον αὐτοῖς ὅτι Μάρκου θυγατὴρ εἶ.*

Posterity has indeed cause to bless the unknown benefactor who caused to be published this *μεγαλωφελέστατον βιβλίον*. But it does not seem to have attracted much attention at the time or for centuries after. We can trace it but fitfully through the ages, as known to one here and another there, to a Themistius, an Arethas, a Suidas, a Tzetzes. Hardly did it

win through to our own days in one MS now lost and in another that is incomplete, and it narrowly escaped the fate of coming to us merely as *disjecta membra* in one of those anthologies which we owe to the "moths of history," the excerptors and epitomizers.

C. R. HAINES.

GODALMING.

A FRAGMENT OF CORINNA.

[Ὁ δὲ λο]ύπησι κ[άθ]εκτος
[χαλεπ]ῆσιν Fελ[ικ]ὼν ἐ-
[σέρυε] λιττάδα [π]έτραν·
[ἐνέδω]κεν δ' ὄ[ρο]ς· ὐκτρῶς
[δὲ βο]ῶν οὐ[ψό]θεν εἴρισέ
[νιν ἐ]μ μου[ριά]δεσσι λαῦς.

So the Berlin editors of the fragment, first printed in *Berlin. Klass. Texte* v. ii. p. 28 (1907); but it is important to observe that the reading of the Papyrus in line 6 was originally λάυς: ("λάυς, aber der Akzent ist ausgewischt"; note to the transcript on p. 21).

Mr Edmonds, *The new fragments of Alcaeus, Sappho, and Corinna* (1909), p. 17, and E. Diehl, *Supplementum Lyricum* (1908), p. 15, print this text. Εἴρισε is for ἤρεισε, λαῦς for λαοῖς (cf. ὐκτρῶς in the preceding line, τύ = τοι earlier in the fragment and φῦβος for φοῖβος in the following fragment); and the passage is supposed to mean: "Helicon drew a rock towards him; the mountain gave way; and with a bitter cry he pushed the rock from above upon myriads of folk." But apart from the reading, another difficulty may be raised.

This text gives an unlikely meaning. Who are these 'myriads'? Inhabitants, or bystanders? The epithet is exaggerated, and the additional detail is unexpected and surprising. Besides, if such a catastrophe had been mentioned in the mythology connected with Helicon, we might expect to find some reference to it in other writers, in Pausanias, for instance, who preserves many stories connected with Helicon in Book IX.

Now there is some evidence for a heteroclite form of λᾶας "stone." In Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus* 196

λέχριός γ' ἐπ' ἄκρου
λᾶος βραχὺς ὀκλάσας

so given by all editors, the Laurentian and other MSS. give λάου, which editors have altered too hastily, thereby giving an unpleasant sigmatism. The Scholiast on the passage quotes Herodian ἐν τῷ ε΄ τῆς καθόλου (= Lentz i. p. 109, 6, as taking it from a nominative λᾶος (LS say "as if from λᾶας, first declension"): τὸ δὲ λᾶος παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐπ' ἄκρου λάου; and Suidas s.v. λᾶας has λᾶας λίθος· καὶ λάου λίθου, then quoting the words from Sophocles. May not the original reading of the Papyrus of Corinna be right, λάυς being for λάοις, and the sense be, what the context requires: "amid an avalanche of stones"?

The poetess, "who treats of Boeotian folk-tales without Pindar's pomp" (Wilamowitz), is describing an avalanche, that is, the breaking away of a large piece of rock bringing a shower of stones in its train. Mr Allen, on Homeric Hymn iii 383

ἦ, καὶ ἐπὶ ῥίον ὦσεν ἄναξ ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων
πέτρῃσι προχυτῇσιν, ἀπέκρυψεν δὲ ῥέεθρα

shows that πέτρῃσι προχυτῇσιν means "an avalanche." There is a close correspondence between the two writers in the phrases: ῥίον ὦσε in the Hymn = πέτραν εἴρισε in Corinna, and πέτρῃσι προχυτῇσιν = ἐμ μυριάδεσσι λάϋς; and the incident narrated in the Hymn happened on a spur of Helicon, Mount Telphusius above Haliartus, just as the incident in Corinna happened on Helicon. The passage in Callimachus, *Hymn to Delos* 133 sqq., about Pangaeus has the same meaning; so too Hesiod, *Scutum* 374 sqq. (Allen), and perhaps 437 sqq. We may add the description in Pausanias x. 23, 3, of the rocks which, slipping from Parnassus, crushed the soldiers in Brennus' army of Gallic invaders.

I suggest therefore that λάυς of the Papyrus prima manu, λαυς secunda, ought not to have been "emended" to λαῦς.

J. U. POWELL.

ON *EUDEMIAN ETHICS* 1215A 29: 1215B 20: 1224B 2

Eudemian Ethics A iv 2. 1215a 29 *λέγω δὲ φορτικὰς μὲν τὰς πρὸς δόξαν πραγματευομένας μόνον, βαναύσους δὲ τὰς ἐδραίας καὶ μισθαρνικάς, χρηματιστικὰς δὲ τὰς πρὸς ἀγορὰς μὲν καὶ πράσεις καπηλικάς.*

Susemihl's note on line 31 is as follows: "*πρὸς*] *πρὸς ὢν* pr. P^b, *πρὸς ὧν* C^c D^c et rc. P^b, *ἴσως πρὸς ὠνὰσ* mg. rc. P^b, rec. Fr. || *ἀγορὰς μὲν* Z P^b C^c D^c corruptum, *ἀγορὰς* M^b Ald. Bk. Bu., *ἀγοράσεις* Sylburgius, *ἀγοραίας* Fr. ||." In short, the MSS give *ὢν ἀγορὰς μὲν* or *ἀγοράς*; Aldus, Bekker, Bussemaker, *ἀγοράς*; Sylburg *ἀγοράσεις*; Fritzsche *ὠνὰς ἀγοραίας*. I venture to think that we should read *ἀγορασμόν*. Susemihl, to whom I submitted this conjecture, told me that it had been anticipated: but I do not remember who the scholar was to whom he ascribed it. I still think that it deserves consideration.

A v 2. 1215b 20 *ὥστε δῆλον ὅτι κἂν ἐξ ἀρχῆς αἱρετὸν ἦν, εἴ τις αἵρεσιν ἐδίδου, διά γε ταῦτα τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις <τίς> ὁ βίος, ὃν ζῶσιν ἔτι παῖδες ὄντες; καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἀνακάμψαι πάλιν οὐδεὶς ἂν ὑπομείνειεν εὖ φρονῶν. ἔτι δὲ πολλὰ τῶν τε μηδεμίαν ἐχόντων [μὲν] ἡδονὴν ἢ λύπην, καὶ τῶν ἐχόντων μὲν ἡδονὴν μὴ καλὴν δέ, τοιαῦτ' ἐστὶν ὥστε τὸ μὴ εἶναι κρεῖττον εἶναι τοῦ ζῆν.*

On 22 Susemihl comments: "*τίς* add. Casaubonus Fr. et fort. iam In." The truth is that the punctuation is faulty. Omitting Casaubon's *τίς*, substitute (1) a comma for the note of interrogation after *ὄντες* and (2) a comma for the full stop after *φρονῶν*. *καὶ γὰρ—φρονῶν* 23, 24 is a parenthesis: *ὁ βίος* and *πολλά* are the subjects to *τοιαῦτ' ἐστιν κτλ.*

B viii 9. 1224b 2 *ὅτι μὲν οὖν δοκοῦσιν οὗτοι μόνοι βίᾳ καὶ ἄκοντες ποιεῖν, καὶ διὰ τίν' αἰτίαν, ὅτι καθ' ὁμοιότητά τινα τοῦ βίᾳ, καθ' ἣν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀψύχων λέγομεν, εἴρηται.*

Susemihl's note is: "1224b 3 *μόνοι* recte offendit Rieckherum, *ἀμφότεροι* (ex eiusdem translatione) ? Susem." In place of *μόνοι*, I would suggest *μόνον οὐ*.

HENRY JACKSON.

WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT: A PERSONAL APPRECIATION.

It is just half a century since, as an undergraduate of Trinity, I began to take in the successive volumes of the great Cambridge Shakespeare edited by W. G. Clark in association (after the first volume) with the vigorous scholar whose loss we have had lately to deplore, William Aldis Wright. Clark was then a tutor of the College, the most accomplished and urbane of dons and men, whose word of encouragement or admonition to an undergraduate of a literary turn was a thing prized beyond gold. With him, though I was not his pupil, I had had before my degree the good luck to come more than once into admiring contact. But his colleague in the Shakespeare work (and afterwards in the editorship of this Journal), Aldis Wright, was in those days a much more secluded personage, and to the average undergraduate even unknown. Once on the foundation, indeed, one could scarcely fail to come in contact with him in his capacity of College librarian; and to consult him was to learn how much zeal in labour and promptness in help could go together with how strict a reserve and brevity in manner and accost.

From that day until all but yesterday, Aldis Wright stood in my mind, as in the minds of so many of us, as a typical, established, abiding personality in the college life, a personality that was in itself an institution. Probably this impression may have been strongest on those who, like myself, have held a variable relation to that life, for considerable periods intimate, and then, through pressure of circumstance, for longer

periods much more detached and casual than we should have wished. For whatever stay, prolonged or fleeting, we might come back, there for a certainty would be Aldis Wright; physically, after he once turned iron-grey, more unchanging than almost any man, filling with exact diligence for a quarter of a century the office of senior bursar, for twenty-six years exercising a courteous hospitality as Vice-Master, and working all the while, we knew, with unshakable tenacity of toil at a surprising diversity of subjects. There was something about his bodily presence that accurately bespoke and corresponded to the character of his mind; something set, austerely square-cut and vigorously compact, with a manner plain and self-sufficing which invited no intimacy. But his austerity was largely on the surface, and even on the surface was largely tempered with humour: humour grim and sardonic enough, no doubt, in dealing with anything that struck him as cant or flummery or affectation, but very kindly towards those who moved him to liking or respect. The square and solid sense of fun that was in him was seen at its best, I have been told and can well believe, in contrast with and enjoyment of the whimsicality and charm of a humourist of a much airier type, the late Canon Ainger.

Of whole fields of Wright's work in criticism and research I have no capacity to speak. But all of us who love letters can in some measure discern and appreciate the qualities of rigid exactness and common sense, the steadfastness of true zeal and scorn of gush or pretension, which mark and render invaluable his work on the text of Shakespeare and Milton, on Bacon, and in the preparation of the great edition of Burton which he did not live to complete. Grateful, too, we can and should all be for the sympathy which attached this man of few intimacies in bonds of almost filial affection to a spirit of a stamp most dissimilar to his own—a brother East-Anglian, it is true, but an East-Anglian of Irish blood and name—I mean of course Edward Fitzgerald. As a Suffolk-bred boy myself, I was used constantly to encounter and, I fear, unknowing all he was, inwardly to deride that eccentric, ineffectual recluse of genius (remember his own name for himself, Ballyblunder), as

he strolled or rather vaguely drifted, an odd, rumpled, melancholy-looking figure in grey plaid, green eye-shade, and shabby back-tilted hat, along the lanes and highways of the Woodbridge neighbourhood. Certainly no greater apparent contrast could have been found than between him and that model of purposeful and business-like efficiency in life and learning, Aldis Wright, in whom he found so serviceable a friend and so faithful an editor.

SIDNEY COLVIN.

IN MEMORIAM: WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT.

William Aldis Wright was born at Beccles in Suffolk, 1 August 1831. Having received his early education at the Beccles Grammar School, he matriculated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1850, and was elected to a scholarship in 1853. In 1854 he took the mathematical tripos, and was placed eighteenth amongst the wranglers. The bachelor's degree having been opened to nonconformists in 1856, Wright graduated B.A. in 1858, and M.A. (nondeclarant) in 1861. He was appointed Stanhope librarian of the College in 1863. From June 1870 to December 1895 he was senior bursar. In 1878 he was elected to a Fellowship as "a person eminent for learning." From February 1888 till his death, 19 May 1914, he was Vice-Master. At one time he was a member of the General Board of Studies: and for many years he was a Syndic of the Press, and took a principal part in all business affecting the Revised Version of the Bible.

Wright's life, though quiet and uneventful, was rich in literary alliances and friendships. In particular, C. W. King, W. G. Clark, E. B. Cowell, Edward Fitzgerald, B. W. Ginsburg, and W. W. Skeat, were among his intimates. He was an active member of the Roxburghe Club, and his judgment was greatly valued by his brother members. In consequence of his secretaryship of the Old Testament Revision Company, of his Vice-Mastership of Trinity College, and of his connexion with learned societies, he had a very large acquaintance with men of letters and other distinguished contemporaries. Strangers who met him never failed to be attracted by his effective conversation, his command of facts, and a certain precise but not unkindly austerity of bearing. Many inquiries

were addressed to him about former members of the College, about Shakespearean difficulties, about points in English literature, and about other matters; and he earned the gratitude of very many students by his punctual and methodical replies.

There are some scholars who allow themselves to be fascinated and possessed by particular problems, soluble or insoluble, which thenceforward occupy their thoughts and dominate their being. It was not so with Wright: mysteries, speculations, controversies, did not interest him. Rather, he would find for himself, or accept from another, a practicable task, useful but laborious, and carry it through to the end patiently and persistently, never hurrying and never resting, but completing with absolute regularity the daily portion which he had appointed for himself. The scheme of the Cambridge Shakespeare was settled by William George Clark and John Glover, the editors of the first volume; but there can be no doubt that Wright took a large share in the preparation and publication of the eight subsequent volumes: and the series of select plays with an interpretative comment which was published by the Clarendon Press was an important supplement to the Macmillan text.

The work which Wright did as secretary to the Old Testament Revision Company must have been prodigious: and it may be that his familiarity with the English of the earlier time helped to make the Old Testament Company more conservative than the New Testament Company in their treatment of the language of the Authorized Version.

The editing of Fitzgerald's letters was no small undertaking; and Wright's output in other ways was very large. The sum of his achievement is all the more remarkable when it is remembered that, during twenty-five years, in addition to these literary labours, he was responsible for the management of the estates and finances of a large college.

There was one *magnum opus* which Wright contemplated but did not complete. He told Mr H. F. Stewart that as long ago as 31 August 1871, he completed an index to the quotations in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*; that is to say, a list of the pages in the *Anatomy* in which each author

was mentioned: and from that time till his death he found occasional amusement in tracking and verifying Burton's citations. The copy of the *Anatomy* in which he methodically recorded citations identified will be of very great value to some future editor.

In 1868, when, through the liberality and public spirit of Messrs Macmillan, the *Journal of Philology* was established, three editors were appointed: W. G. Clark, J. E. B. Mayor, W. A. Wright. Plainly, Clark represented Greek, Mayor Latin, and Wright Hebrew. But Wright's services to the *Journal* have been much more than departmental. He conducted the correspondence, he read the proofs, and he superintended the publication, leaving to his colleagues no more than the occasional duty of advising about papers offered by would-be contributors. In recent years his colleagues would gladly have relieved him of the routine, or, at least, shared it with him. But it was characteristic of the man that he took a pleasure in the exact performance of familiar duties: and that, although as early as 1878 he announced his intention of resigning the editorship, he continued to be editor in chief, and to do what he had done during W. G. Clark's long illness, until the beginning of his own last illness, some two years and a half ago. William Aldis Wright will have a place in the history of English scholarship as Hebraist, as Shakespearean, and as the scholarly editor of English texts, rather than as a classical philologist: but the *Journal of Philology* owes much to his industry, exactitude, and fidelity; and his surviving colleagues desire to record their grateful testimony to the importance of his work as Editor, and their sense of the loss which they as well as the *Journal* have sustained by his death.

I. B.
H. J.
H. W. G.

2 *July* 1914.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.